DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 100 574 RC 008 264

TITLE National Rural Manpower Conference: Summary of Proceedings (Atlanta, Georgia, January 18-20, 1971).

INSTITUTION Manpower Administration (DOL), Washington, D.C. U.S. Training and Employment Service.

PUB DATE 20 Jan 71

NOTE 71p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.75 HC-$3.15 PLUS POSTAGE

DESCRIPTORS *Agency Role; *Conference Reports; Delivery Systems; Employment Trends; *Interagency Coordination; *Manpower Development; Migrant Workers; Program Descriptions; *Rural Areas; Speeches; State Agencies; Workshops

ABSTRACT

An annual event since 1951, this conference was held to: (1) review the previous year's activities of the Rural Manpower Service and its cooperating agencies; (2) discuss plans for the new year; and (3) study the problems of rural areas. Most of the 250 persons attending the 3-day conference were officials of the Manpower Administration and its affiliated State agencies. The speeches, workshops, and special meetings revealed "a definite break with the past". The new strategy of the Rural Manpower Service placed less emphasis on farm placement activity and more on experimentation to find new ways of helping rural workers--both farm and nonfarm. This report gives the speeches and the discussions from the plenary sessions, workshops, and special meetings. Topics covered include: rural manpower strategy; the manpower challenge in rural areas; the commitment to serve rural America; artificial barriers to employment--recognizing cultural differences; agricultural unionization; new approaches for organizing the delivery of manpower services; rural manpower staff development; promotion of involvement and interagency coordination; the Migrant Experimental and Demonstration Project; and Florida and Texas recruitment. (NQ)

rec 12-11-74

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED 100574

NATIONAL RURAL MANPOWER CONFERENCE
January 18-20, 1971
Sheraton-Biltmore Hotel, Atlanta Georgia

SUMMARY OF PROCEEDINGS

The National Rural Manpower Conference was held under the auspices of the Rural Manpower Service, U. S. Training and Employment Service, Manpower Administration, U. S. Department of Labor. A yearly event since 1951, the conference was convened for the purpose of reviewing the previous year's activities of RMS (formerly the Farm Labor and Rural Manpower Service) and agencies that cooperate with it, discussing plans for the new year, and studying the problems of rural areas.

Approximately 250 persons attended the convention; most of them were officials of the Manpower Administration and its affiliated State agencies.

Agenda

The conference was opened by the General Chairman, Dr. Daniel W. Sturt, Director, Rural Manpower Service. After the invocation by the Reverend Dr. Marmon B. Moore, Executive Director, Christian Council of Metropolitan Atlanta, greetings were extended by Mr. Sam Caldwell, Commissioner of Labor for the State of Georgia, and Mr. William O. Norwood, Jr., Regional Manpower Administrator for Region IV.

The speeches, workshops, and special meetings which followed revealed a definite break with the past. The new strategy of the Rural Manpower Service places less emphasis on farm placement activity and more on experimentation to find new ways of helping rural workers--both farm and nonfarm. The details are given in the attached materials. (See list of attachments.)

Summary and Conclusions

The U. S. Department of Labor has a commitment to provide rural workers with equity of access to manpower services. That is, the rural worker should receive that same quality and quantity of services as the urban worker.

Because of the wide dispersion of the rural population, delivery of adequate manpower services requires innovative approaches including special arrangements with other agencies.

No single agency can solve the problems of rural poverty alone. To work toward this objective, means of furthering interagency cooperation should be explored.

RC008264

Federal legislation should be enacted which will give a farmer's employees an opportunity to vote whether or not they want a union to represent them. If more than one union is seeking representation, the workers should have an opportunity to choose the union they prefer.

Farm job orders were reported to be falling off substantially. State agencies did not expect to be able to provide farm employment for all migrants seeking their help this year. It was concluded that the experience gained from the Migrant Experimental and Demonstration Project would be needed to design new approaches to handling migrants.

Because many migrants and other rural workers are members of minority groups, State agencies should hire members of these minorities to work with their own people and should give minority spokesmen a voice in program planning.

As the method of operation changes, so does the role of staff members formerly engaged in farm placement activities. Plans are under way to train staff members to assume their new role.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

List of Attachments

BEST COPY AVAILABLE.

Speeches--

A COMMITMENT TO SERVE RURAL AMERICA, Malcolm R. Lovell, Jr., Assistant Secretary of Labor for Manpower.

RURAL MANPOWER STRATEGY, Daniel W. Sturt, Director, Rural Manpower Service.

THE MANPOWER CHALLENGE IN RURAL AREAS, Dale E. Hathaway, Professor of Agricultural Economics, Michigan State University.

Plenary Sessions--

ARTIFICIAL BARRIERS TO EMPLOYMENT--RECOGNIZING CULTURAL DIFFERENCES

BUSINESS MEETING AND PANEL DISCUSSION

Workshops--

AGRICULTURAL UNIONIZATION--IMPLICATIONS FOR WORKERS, EMPLOYERS, AND PUBLIC OFFICIALS

NEW APPROACHES FOR ORGANIZING THE DELIVERY OF MANPOWER SERVICES

RURAL MANPOWER STAFF DEVELOPMENT

PROMOTING INVOLVEMENT AND INTERAGENCY COORDINATION

Special Meetings--

MIGRANT EXPERIMENTAL AND DEMONSTRATION PROJECT

FLORIDA RECRUITMENT

TEXAS RECRUITMENT

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Remarks By

MALCOLM R. LOVELL, JR.

Assistant Secretary of Labor for Manpower

Before The

NATIONAL RURAL MANPOWER CONFERENCE

Atlanta, Georgia

Monday, January 18, 1971

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

A COMMITMENT TO SERVE RURAL AMERICA

This promises to be a successful meeting. Not only have you the manpower specialists of State and Federal governments gathered to exchange ideas and generate the additional enthusiasm you will need for the greater achievements expected of you, but you are joined by co-workers and friends in other parts of State and Federal governments who are just as dedicated and just as involved in rural life as you are.

I hope that you in the fields of health, agriculture, rural poverty, education, and any other disciplines represented here today, will feel perfectly free--indeed, obliged--to speak up and put in your 2 cents' worth when a good idea strikes you during the course of this conference. We need all the constructive suggestions we can lay our hands on. So don't hesitate to chime in.

You all know the main problem facing us--and most of all, facing the people who live in rural America. Inadequate economic development has meant that there simply aren't enough jobs out there in those rural areas.

And I think there won't be much disagreement with me when I say that the main mission of the Federal-State rural manpower team is to help rural people prepare themselves for a new role in the American economy. No longer can they depend on their agricultural skills to feed, clothe, and educate their children. They now must be helped to learn the skills that will make them valuable to the kinds of employers that are coming--now and in the future--to rural areas. I mean employers in the fields of light industry, food processing, tourism,--plus the whole gamut of services that follow along in the wake of economic development--transportation, food distribution, education, health services, and so on.

Continuation of the trends of the past several decades in population distribution and economic growth would be disastrous for much of rural America. Further draining of the younger and abler portion of the rural work force to urban areas would leave a larger residual of older and unskilled workers--unable to support the basic public services of rural communities.

All of this means we must act fast. We can't wait until next year, or when the funding seems a little more assured, or when the paperwork is cleared off our desks. We have to do something now. Because every week that goes by sees another exodus of rural people heading for the city.

I cannot emphasize enough the urgency of getting more rural manpower services going. And I cannot emphasize too strongly the Labor Department's commitment to provide for rural people manpower services equivalent in quantity and quality to those of their urban counterparts. In a word, the Labor Department is committed to equity.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

There is solid evidence that there has not been equity. Rural people have been shortchanged.

These problems are widely recognized. A few months ago, the National Governors' Conference called for adoption of a national population growth and distribution policy "... to lessen the congestion, and reduce pressure, on the already overburdened resources of our cities, to offer opportunities for the free movement of all of our citizens to realize their maximum personal potential, to match manpower and job training programs with the needs for community development and to lessen the problems of transportation, environmental decay and social delivery that are not being adequately dealt with for today's population. Such a policy shall be consonant with a rural-urban balance of needs and regional potentials."

A resolution of the December 1969 Congress of Cities called for "a specific policy for the settlement of people throughout the Nation to balance the concentration of population among and within metropolitan and nonmetropolitan areas while providing social and economic opportunity for all persons."

Finally, this Administration's concern for the welfare of rural America is seen in the creation of the President's Council for Rural Affairs, now part of the Domestic Affairs Council. As President Nixon made clear in his first State of the Union message, the problems of the city are inseparable from those of the countryside. Here is what he said:

> "What rural America most needs is a new kind of assistance. It needs to be dealt with, not as a separate nation, but as part of an overall growth policy for all America. We must create a new rural environment that will not only stem the migration to urban centers but reverse it. If we seize our growth as a challenge, we can make the 1970's an historic period when by conscious choice we transformed our land into what we want it to become."

It is clear that there is widespread recognition of the problems of rural America, and a growing commitment to finding solutions.

Let me review quickly the sources of these problems. The story is not a new one to many of you, I realize.

The technological revolution in agriculture has substituted machines and chemicals for labor on a phenomenal scale. According to USDA figures, farm employment dropped by more than one-half between 1947 and 1969--from 10.4 million to 4.6 million. Efficient use of the large capital requirements for mechanization calls for large farms, and in the

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

process of consolidating farming units, many thousands of small farm operators, tenants, and sharecroppers were displaced. Although farming afforded most of them a marginal level of living at best, tremendous readjustment problems--that have never been fully resolved--were created by the displacement of so many families with limited educational and vocational skills.

The huge decline in agricultural employment--plus a substantial decline in mining employment--were too much to be offset by growth in other industries in or near rural areas. The result has been widespread unemployment and underemployment and a massive rural-urban migration. It should be noted, of course, that economic necessity is not the only reason why people leave. Many rural youths go to the cities to get a better education, or for a livelier social and cultural environment.

During the 1950's, approximately one-half million people migrated each year from predominantly rural counties. The trend continued in the 1960's, but began to taper off in the latter years of the decade. However, continuing mechanization and consolidation of farms ensure further migration, either to rural nonfarm areas or to cities. During the '50's and '60's, several hundred rural counties actually lost population, as net migration exceeded natural population growth. Basic health, education, welfare, and other services are inadequate in most of these counties because the cost of government and social services must be spread over a shrinking population and economic base. Furthermore, since the most common personal characteristic of the people who moved away is their youth, the cost must be borne by a population drained of some of its most vigorous elements.

Many rural residents are ill equipped for employment other than in low-pay, low-skill jobs. Nearly half of all farm residents aged 25 or over have only eight years of education or less. The educational attainment of the residents of rural nonfarm areas is somewhat better, although over one-third have only eight years of schooling or less. Because of this educational deprivation, or simply because of the nature of the jobs available, many rural workers have no skills, or limited skills at best.

In addition to the inability of nonfarm industries to absorb those displaced from agriculture, who lack education and skills, other factors contribute to the poverty in rural areas. These include the high birth rates in farm families, the low returns to operators of marginal farms, the low wages and intermittent employment of hired farmworkers, and racial discrimination against the large numbers of rural residents who are Negroes, Mexican Americans, or Indians.

These then are the roots of rural problems. We in the Labor Department hope to help solve them by achieving our ultimate goal of giving rural people equity of access to manpower services. Providing

 BEST COPY AVAILABLE

services of any kind, including manpower services, is necessarily a more expensive undertaking in rural areas than in cities. In the case of manpower services, employment offices are usually located in urban centers, where the large numbers of orders, applications, and other transactions reduce unit costs. At the same time, these urban offices offer a wider range of services to more employers and workers.

But this pattern of location means that many rural people are not within reach of any local office. Farm labor representatives have provided the only employment service in many rural areas. In some States, the farm labor representatives have also serviced rural nonfarm workers and employers, particularly in the food processing and other agriculture-related industries. More frequently, however, they have had to concentrate on meeting seasonal farm labor needs and coordinating the movements of migratory farmworkers.

The role of the employment service in serving rural people was broadened in 1969 by the creation of a Farm Labor and Rural Manpower Service to replace the previous Farm Labor Service. We believe that progress has been made in achieving our immediate goals of more effective use of existing staff and budget resources in meeting the needs of the rural population and ending the compartmentalization of service which tended to exclude rural nonfarm employers and workers.

Dr. Sturt will discuss in more detail the methods and techniques for bringing about equity of manpower services to rural areas. Now, I would like to touch briefly on some other new developments affecting rural people.

Occupational Safety and Health Act

The Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 is a major legislative accomplishment that will have a profound effect on the lives of 57 million American workers and their families.

The bill authorizes the Federal Government to set and enforce occupational safety and health standards applicable to businesses in interstate commerce. This is the first and only Federal legislation affecting the health and safety of farmworkers, except for the Fair Labor Standards Act which forbids the employment of children under 17 years of age in hazardous farmwork.

National safety legislation is urgently needed. Deaths and disabling injuries from occupational hazards have been on the increase for more than a decade. In 1969, farmwork was second only to construction in number of workers killed. That year, 2,500 workers lost their lives on farms, and 210,000 suffered disabling injuries--so serious that they missed work.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The new law covers 57 million of our total work force of 78 million. The remaining 21 million aren't left out, but are protected by existing special legislation covering such industries as mining, transportation, and maritime industries. Workers in private households, in intrastate commerce, and in Federal, State, and local governments are not covered by the new law.

As to administration, there will be promulgation of Federal standards by the Secretary of Labor, with the assistance of advisory committees.

There will be enforcement, of course, with adequate provision for appeals before an Occupational Safety and Health Appeals Commission with authority to affirm, modify, or vacate the Secretary's enforcement actions. Orders by the Commission are subject to review by the U. S. Courts of Appeals.

States that desire to set and enforce their own occupational safety and health standards will submit plans for State administration to the Secretary of Labor. The Secretary is authorized to make grants to States to assist in identifying needs, developing plans, and improving administration of their occupational health and safety laws. States will assume jurisdiction upon the Secretary's approval of their plan.

Incidentally, the law authorized direct loans to small businesses to assist them in complying with the standards required under the new act.

The act goes into effect April 28 of this year. And I should point out to you, by the way, that there has been no money appropriated as yet to administer it. We hope that this action will be taken early in the new session of Congress.

Unemployment Insurance Amendments

Another legislative landmark of concern to rural people is the 1970 amendments to the Unemployment Insurance law. Officially known as the "Employment Security Amendments of 1970," the bill was signed into law by the President August 10, 1970. All but 11 million workers are now covered by unemployment compensation laws in their States. Among the uncovered workers are farmworkers, along with domestic workers and employees of State and local governments.

We expect the Administration to propose the extension of Unemployment Insurance to farmworkers again this year. As a basis for the proposal, the Unemployment Insurance Service is asking our regional manpower administrators for information about farm employers who have elected to cover some or all of their employees. In most States, you realize, I am sure, some farm employers have elected to cover some or all of their workers.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

What we are seeking is data on the cost-benefit experience of these employers, plus something of the job histories and characteristics of the employees covered by Unemployment Insurance.

The Comprehensive Manpower Act

What would have been--or could have been, I should say--a legislative landmark in manpower affairs, was the comprehensive manpower bill that was vetoed--with disappointment--by the President. Without going into a long and tedious exposition of the bill's adventures in the legislative labyrinth, I would simply like to say that the final version as worked out by the Conference Committee would have done a disservice to American working people, and to people without training or experience who wanted to prepare themselves for a genuine contributing role in the economic system.

Despite the failure of the bill to pass the final test, I think it sheds valuable light on what is to come. It is certainly a fact that more Congressmen gave more thought to manpower legislation in the past year and a half since the Administration's manpower bill was submitted than in any other period of time, ever.

All of this consideration means that the Congress is well informed as to manpower matters, and the next time that comprehensive manpower legislation is submitted, a far more satisfactory bill will result.

The proposed comprehensive manpower bill would have definitely strengthened manpower services in rural areas. This would have been achieved through decentralization of administration and funding. With the Secretary of Labor's approval, rural areas could have taken over sponsorship of comprehensive manpower program services. In other cases, rural areas would have been served by State agencies acting as prime sponsors for programs in the areas of the State other than the larger cities. Under either arrangement, sponsorship would have been by State or local bodies rather than by the Federal Government exclusively. This would have resulted in greater flexibility and effectiveness, as local people would have been using local experience and judgment to solve local problems. And it would have been simple justice that the funds to support these programs come from Federal revenues, which--after all--came originally from local taxpayers.

Thus, under the proposed legislation, employment and training programs could have been tailored to fit local needs and conditions, and yet there would have been the necessary funding to carry out these aims.

One of the programs that was very favorably regarded by both the House and the Senate is the Jobs for Progress, or Operation SER, program. This, you recall, is the generally rural counterpart, in Spanish-speaking communities, of the highly successful Opportunities Industrialization Centers that operate in many large cities.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The success of these programs--one urban, one rural primarily--brings to mind another of the Administration's serious objections to the comprehensive manpower bill approved by the Congress.

On the one hand, Congress seemed to be willing to accept large numbers of people employed in public service jobs that led nowhere, that prepared them for no permanent contributing role in the economic system.

On the other hand, the Administration was trying to hold on to the idea that in public service work people must be trained for jobs with a definite career path--jobs that lead to a secure, needed role in the economy--jobs that offer the holder a future.

Carrying Out Our Commitment To Rural People

Getting back to our commitment--yours, mine, the President's--to revitalize the economy of rural areas, I have to admit that there will be some very great problems.

All of Government in these times is being asked to do more with less money. This I accept as a challenge to our ingenuity, to our experience, to our determination to make the programs in our charge the most effective possible.

We in Government should remind each other that we cannot do it all ourselves--nor should we try. It is only through the partnership of public and private interests that anything workable and of real benefit can be accomplished. So I urge you to enlist the help of outside groups whenever you think they can make a constructive contribution, in any phase of our programs.

But the main burden rests on our shoulders. However, I am convinced that there are some untapped resources at our command.

In serving rural areas there are unique problems. Most of them have to do with geographical factors--widely dispersed population, difficult to reach by road or telephone. The geographical factors also generate other barriers--cultural and social.

If we are to provide rural people with manpower services of proper quality and quantity--and not spend a lot more money doing it--it is obvious that we must find some new approaches. This means looking beyond our traditional ways of doing business.

Many of these nontraditional methods are known to you. I urge you to put them to use. Have no fear that I, or anyone else in the Labor Department, will think of you as "odd ball" for applying these novel techniques.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

You must also continue the search for still newer ideas.

In fact, we have on the drawing board right now Operation Hitchhike. Its purpose is to use compatible community organizations to help us provide manpower services in rural areas. For example, under this new approach we might contract with the Cooperative Extension Service, or another well-established organization with wide contacts in rural areas. Along with their normal operations, we would ask them to perform various services--like recruiting suitable applicants, interviewing them, helping them fill out employment applications, or counseling.

All of this would be under the general guidance of rural manpower specialists in the State ES agency, of course.

The beauty of Operation Hitchhike, we think, is that it makes fuller use of fine rural organizations that over the years have won a reputation for skilled and dedicated service to rural people. It pays tribute to the high esteem that rural people have for these organizations.

This is just one indication of the new direction in which we must go. Don't hesitate to try out the new ideas that strike you. Let us know about what doesn't work as well as what does. Don't wait to be urged, and don't wait for someone else to try it, but plow right in and turn your hunches into realities.

You will be right in line with this Administration's dedication to decentralization and innovation in government.

To conclude my remarks, the problems arising from past migrations of population and the aimless drift to urbanization are among the most critical and difficult domestic problems of our time. Their solution, or at least their amelioration, calls not only for extension of manpower services to rural areas, but also for expansion and coordination of both public and private efforts to aid and encourage economic development in rural areas.

Bringing manpower services to rural areas will not, by itself, create a new rural environment but it is an essential element in achieving the main goal defined by the President's Task Force on Rural Development in its report of March 1970. That goal is to bring jobs to rural people by "improving the economic opportunities in the small cities, towns, villages, and farm communities of rural America." We are committed to doing everything within our power to accomplish this objective.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Remarks By

DANIEL W. STUNT

Director, Rural Manpower Service

Before The

NATIONAL RURAL MANPOWER CONFERENCE

Atlanta, Georgia

Monday, January 18, 1971

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

RURAL MANPOWER STRATEGY

Several months ago, you were asked to suggest topics for discussion at this annual meeting. The workshops scheduled for this afternoon and tomorrow are in response to your recommendations. But almost every State agency expressed interest in a discussion of the role of the Rural Manpower Service.

What I propose to do this morning is share with you my thinking as to where the Rural Manpower Service is headed and how we propose to get there.

Let's begin by developing a framework for discussion. Before we can hope to deal with rural manpower problems, I think it important that there be a common understanding or a collective notion of what it is that we are talking about. Now this may surprise some of you--the idea that there is any confusion over what constitutes a rural area or who is a rural resident--but I can assure you that I have encountered almost as many different concepts during the last four months as groups I have spoken to. For program purposes, we define a rural area as a county in which 50 percent or more of the people are classified as rural according to the Census. Perhaps, other more workable definitions could be developed; however, in the meantime, this is the operative definition that we are using.

Presently, some 2,150 of the more than 3,100 counties in the United States would be considered as rural under this definition and approximately 62 million people live in these areas.

But when we start to consider what is meant by rural manpower, perhaps it would be well to think diagrammatically of concentric circles each larger and including the other with migrant workers at the center, followed by seasonal farmworkers, year-round hired workers, farm operators and their families, agribusiness manpower, and rural nonfarm manpower as the circles get larger. Rural manpower encompasses some 30 million of the 80 million total work force and, as such, is much larger than the 3 million farm labor clientele which has in years past been our primary concern.

We must also take into account some characteristics of the population of rural areas. The rural sector has exceptionally large proportions of its population who are too poorly educated to enter directly and readily into modern occupations or occupational training--farm or nonfarm. In part, this reflects prejudice against minority groups and neglect of their obstacles to obtaining educational competence. And underlying this,

 BEST COPY AVAILABLE

with impact upon all, is the fact that the school systems of many States with large rural populations have been too poor to meet the demands of an advancing society. The consequences for manpower development are many--including the need for extraordinary outreach efforts in order to overcome diffidence and elicit response to opportunities. It also means starting the process of human resource development at a lower level.

Looking at the economic situation, I don't think it is overstating the case to say that there is a quiet crisis taking place in rural America today. Production agriculture, once the economic base of rural areas, is no longer the basic means of livelihood for the 29 percent of our population which is classified as rural. Indeed, only 5 percent of our population is devoted to farming, even on a part-time basis. Nonfarm jobs and agribusiness, as opposed to farm production employment, are the economic lifeblood of rural people. The dramatic change from rural farm to rural nonfarm in the makeup of our rural economy as brought with it human and institutional adjustments that have strained the social and economic fibre of rural America to the breaking point.

Society's preoccupation with agriculture technology and the cheap-food policies which are supportive of this technology have been responsible for millions of people being released from their farming endeavors to non-farm activities. The shift away from farm employment has not always been a "pull" to more attractive work; too often it has been a "push" to less attractive work or no work at all. The human fallout of unbridled agricultural technology has found its way into the cities as unskilled and unprepared workers; it has oftentimes remained in rural areas, unable to compete, unable to cope in a modern economic society.

The statistics of the mass migration from rural to urban areas--some 500,000 per year during the sixties--though somewhat less at the present time, do not tell the extent of back-migration and the expenditures of human, economic, and emotional resources as rural people search for jobs and a place where they feel culturally comfortable.

In addition to the urban problems associated with the exodus of people from rural America, cheap-food-related policies have had other built-in social costs which center around the impact of these policies upon rural communities. The population has become more dispersed, the economic base per capita more fragile, and a service vacuum has resulted--poor schools, poor health services, and the like. As young people have left rural America in search of jobs, a disproportionately larger share of the population which remains behind is that which is in need of high cost services, the very young and the old. Also, the quality of rural leadership and rural institutions has eroded.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The backdrop against which one must assess what is happening in rural America today must include our overall inability to realistically come to grips with such concerns as: the need to guide technological growth and development and establish avenues for coping with the human adjustment problems associated with the adoption of technology; the need for economic growth policy and population distribution policy. The manner in which these concerns are resolved will determine the nature of manpower policy in general and rural manpower policy in particular. For example, shall we encourage programs that will result in people moving to jobs or jobs moving to people?

Today there appears to be a new concern for rural-urban balance, and while all the guidelines are not clear, there is a new societal interest in rural America being manifested. These guidelines are clear enough that we should feel confident in the development of a rural manpower strategy, a plan to help develop human resources in rural areas, a plan to help people in self-fulfillment via the world of work.

Strategy

Our rural manpower strategy contains four basic thrusts: (1) The search for equity of access to manpower and supportive services, and the search for avenues to achieve some semblance of equity for rural people; (2) the development of creative and innovative approaches in providing the spectrum of manpower services for rural people, recognizing the spatial and other differences in serving a rural clientele; (3) arriving at new and supportive interagency arrangements to facilitate maximum public services at minimum cost; and (4) restructuring and reorienting the Rural Manpower Service towards the achievement of the above goals.

Assistant Secretary Lovell has discussed our concern for equity for rural America; he has committed the Manpower Administration to achieving equity in its serving of rural people. I would like to address myself to the other goals which I mentioned--innovative approaches, interagency coordination and cooperation, and restructuring and reorienting the Rural Manpower Service.

Restructuring

Providing adequate manpower services for the people of rural America will entail organizational restructuring of the traditional farm labor services in many States. Also, it will involve new roles and new relationships for all of us. In part, the role of a RMS staff member becomes that of a manpower spokesman for rural people, an advocate, a rural manpower statesman capable of capturing the interests of many organizations and agencies towards the goal of providing better manpower services to rural Americans.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Is there a need for a separate and identifiable Rural Manpower Service or a rural manpower program? I asked this question three years ago when participating in a study of the Farm Labor Service for the U. S. Department of Labor. I am convinced that we do need an identifiable rural manpower program, that the manpower problems confronting rural people are sufficiently different to demand special programming. At the local level, separate programming may not necessarily be as identifiable as at other levels. What other mechanism is there for assuring that rural people are not short changed, that rural people have equity of access to manpower services?

The move from a Farm Labor Service to a Rural Manpower Service has been underway for several years. It is my hope that we can move with greater dispatch programmatically in this direction. Several bold departures from past practices are necessary if we are to evolve as a true Rural Manpower Service, a service with the overall objective of providing, and encouraging others to provide, manpower services for rural people equivalent to those provided in urban areas.

The Farm Labor and Rural Manpower Service at the national level changed its name, on December 31, 1970, to the Rural Manpower Service. Inasmuch as farm labor is a part of rural manpower, there was an inherent redundancy in the old title. But more than a change in title is necessary. We must establish a rural manpower consciousness throughout our organization and, indeed, throughout the Manpower Administration if we are to accomplish our objective.

We have developed a new set of mission and function statements for the Rural Manpower Service at the national level, and are making other approaches to restructuring our organization to accomplish our overall mission of rural manpower program leadership. Each State that has not already done so, and several have, should undertake the kind of organizational restructuring that fits its situation. New plans of service, new codes, new job descriptions, and a host of other innovations are involved in this transition. Working together we can make this transition at all levels. You have a right to expect guidelines from the national office, and we shall attempt to provide them.

Roles and Relationships

New roles and new relationships must be undertaken. Our operational posture must be changed. The limited resources formerly allocated to the Farm Labor Service cannot be sufficiently stretched to adequately serve all rural people. However, shifting of roles along these lines is, I believe, a step in the right direction. To supplement our own resources we must be manpower spokesmen for rural people and make every effort to

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

encourage the allocation of resources to rural manpower programs, resources from within and without the Manpower Administration. Indeed, a significant part of our new role involves that of rural manpower statesmanship, in which we tirelessly serve as the manpower advocate for rural people.

Our primary concern, however, is not the design of an organizational entity but the provision of services to people. Let us not become preoccupied with the means as opposed to the ends. We should be striving not to separate the delivery of services but to enrich the services provided to a heretofore neglected client group.

Innovative Mechanism

I want to turn now to the innovative aspects of our rural manpower strategy. I believe society has a right to expect constant creativity on the part of public servants engaged in programs such as ours. It is this dedication to searching for new and improved approaches to providing rural manpower services that has brought forth a variety of new efforts over the past few years. Let's discuss several of them.

Ottumwa Projects are designed to increase the capability of the Employment Service to carry quality manpower services to residents of rural areas. Experience has shown that the program made it possible both to reach out to employers and workers who reside in rural areas and to create in rural areas repositories of employer and worker service skills capable of having an impact on the problems of rural residents. It is a way of dealing more effectively with rural employment and underemployment, and with the underutilization of manpower by employer establishments. It can also contribute to either stemming or making more rational existing rural-urban migration.

The program is operated by and through the State employment service agencies. While the Manpower Administration has provided special funding, the reorganization and redirection required by the program may be, and has been at least in part, adopted in many areas without this assistance. Specifically, the program involves structuring the service delivery system to reflect the evolution of the geographically relatively large multicounty rural labor market. Once identified, existing facilities within this area are merged and placed under an area director; centralized areawide employer and applicant technical services are introduced; and a Job Bank, manual or computer assisted, as well as sophisticated communications equipment and such other operational innovations as may be advisable are installed.

Where individual projects are operational in adjacent or proximate areas, joint access to Job Bank information is recommended. The Ottumwa concept also makes it possible for the Employment Service to provide support to

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

other agencies active in the manpower field, such as the public schools, vocational schools, and Operation Mainstream and NYC projects. At the same time, these other resources are then available to serve the workers contacted through the Employment Service's expanded outreach capability.

The Smaller Communities Program provides mobile teams extending manpower delivery services to rural areas remote from local ES offices. Interviewing, counseling, testing, and job development services are provided to individuals. The team helps local leaders to analyze area employment problems, prepare manpower reports, and initiate projects of community assistance, including various training and employment programs.

The manpower survey reports are used by community groups in the development of programs to attract new industry. If appropriate training programs are not already available, the mobile office in cooperation with local employers, attempts to establish such training. The mobile team provides assistance to migrants under the Annual Worker Plan and other interstate recruitment procedures.

To be eligible for assistance under the Smaller Communities Program a county must meet the following criteria: (1) it must not be designated a major labor area; (2) must not contain a city of over 50,000; (3) the rural nonfarm population must constitute at least 50 percent of the county's population.

Concerted Services in Training and Education pilot projects have been established in rural areas in 10 States to demonstrate how employment opportunities can be increased and communities improved through an interdepartmental effort to develop additional education and training. Direction is provided by a Task Force cochaired by representatives of the Departments of Labor and HEW and including representatives from the Departments of Agriculture, Commerce, Interior, and HUD, as well as OEO and the Appalachian Commission. Participating agencies share the costs of local coordinators who work with local leaders in identifying needs for education and training and preparing program proposals.

Outstanding success has been achieved by CSTE on a one-country basis. Evaluators have recommended a gradual expansion to see if benefits obtained on a one-county basis can be retained in an expanded version of the program covering more than one county.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

A Migrant E&D Project was conducted during 1969 and 1970 to explore ways of providing migrants with supportive services, as well as manpower services, and offering special help to those families who decide to settle out of the migratory stream. The rationale behind the project was that a successful job placement requires that the worker be helped in solving various personal problems related to holding his job. Migrants travel and work in family groups and the problems of all family members are matters of concern.

Attention was focused on providing services to about 750 migratory families whose home base was the Lower Rio Grande Valley of Texas. In selecting the sample, the Texas agency tried to choose migrants who were planning to travel to specified work locations (target areas) in the nine States that were also participating in the project: Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Minnesota, Ohio, Wisconsin, Idaho, Oregon, and Washington.

The cornerstone of the program was the Rural Outreach Interviewer (ROI) who served as the contact between the employment agency and the family. In recruiting ROI's, the State agencies made an effort to select persons whose background was similar to that of the client group. It was felt that such a person could establish a better relationship with the family than a person from a different culture.

In meeting the needs of project families for supportive services, the cooperation of other agencies was vital. At the local level, the E&D project was presented to a coordinating committee made up of various local agencies serving migrants. Where no such organization existed, the local E&D staff either formed a committee or at least made sure that the local service agencies were acquainted with the objectives and operation of the project.

The E&D staff gave special emphasis to helping migratory families who chose to settle out of the migratory stream. Because farm jobs are diminishing, many of today's migrants are going to have to make the transition from farm to nonfarm employment. Therefore, it was a policy for ROI's to discuss with all project families the possibility of taking nonfarm jobs and settling out.

In 1971, the 10 participating States will incorporate the positive elements of the E&D project into their regular operating programs. And in 1972, the methods of operation developed by the 10 States will be used to extend the program to every State that serves migratory workers.

A basic problem in serving rural America is the dispersion of its people. Although the lack of concentration is a deterrent to riots and demonstrations, it makes the per-capita cost of providing prohibitive. It has been

 BEST COPY AVAILABLE

estimated that the cost of providing services in a highly rural area with its sparse population is three times that of providing similar services in a nonrural area. Inasmuch as rural people are entitled to equity or some semblance of equity in services, it behooves us to arrive at avenues for servicing that are compatible with the basic dispersion problem.

One avenue appears to be "operation hitchhike"--a manpower overlay on existing compatible rural institutions.

Operation Hitchhike is designed to improve manpower services in remote rural areas by developing agreements for certain manpower assistance to be provided by agencies, such as the Cooperative Extension Service, which already have established offices in these communities. The idea is to build on existing organizational entities instead of wasting resources through duplication.

To test the feasibility of this approach, arrangements are being made for four pilot programs to get underway during Fiscal Year 1971. Employment security agencies will contract with the Cooperative Extension Service to provide certain manpower services in remote rural areas. Each project is expected to cost about $250,000 to operate. The results of the pilot programs will not be known for several months. In the meantime, however, States are encouraged to initiate their own hitchhike projects. It seems to me that this approach holds considerable promise. In considering how best to serve remote rural areas, State officials should explore the feasibility of developing agreements with agencies already operating in these counties to provide manpower services.

Involvement and Coordination

Operation Hitchhike and CSTE are two examples of interagency coordination and cooperation. Communication and good working relationships with other agencies providing service to rural areas are necessary at all levels--national, regional, State, and local--if our programs are to be successful. The funds, personnel, and other resources available to our agency and to the agencies providing health, educational, economic-development, and other services in rural areas are too limited to dissipate in uncoordinated efforts to provide narrowly defined services within narrowly structured organizational frameworks. The agencies working in rural areas simply cannot afford the lack of communication that results in duplication of services and competition in lieu of cooperation.

Not only must we keep open our channels of communication with other government agencies in the field, but we must appreciate what private citizens and civic, church, and other groups in the community can do to help solve manpower problems. We must find means of involving this rural community power structure.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Discussion of coordination and cooperation prompts me to make some observations about a related subject. I am disturbed over what I would characterize as an "enforcement syndrome" that seems to pervade much that we do in the Rural Manpower Service. In my view, enforcement activities tend to conflict with the positive posture that is required if we are to work effectively with employers, employees, and citizens in general. Along these lines I am concerned about the proliferation of court cases that seem to restrict our operations in serving people. I do not believe we have provided adequate guidelines to assist those more directly involved in field operations. While I do not have magic answers, I am deeply concerned. I would prefer a positive approach to solving many of the problems associated with manpower servicing which have heretofore revolved around enforcement. For example, we should encourage improved farm labor management through supervisory training, better housing through educational efforts, and access to supportive services through better means of communication. While a limited enforcement dimension may be necessary, in the long run it is not compatible with our best program interests. The National Office will be producing a positive package of ideas and materials to assist you in working to up grade the farm labor environment through such an approach.

Staff Development

Effective program leadership in providing manpower services for rural people, in helping rural people to help themselves, and in bringing manpower resources to bear upon the unique problems of each area, requires new capabilities on the part of much of our existing staff at both national, State, and local levels. To enhance our capabilities to cope with these new roles, intensive reorientation and training will be necessary. Such training should not be devoted exclusively to those holding farm labor and rural manpower positions. It is important that rural manpower problems and their solutions, and the unique concerns of rural people, be woven into the training fabric of the entire Manpower Administration in order to heighten the competence and capabilities of those who will be serving rural areas, both directly and indirectly. It is with this in mind that we have included a rural manpower segment in a variety of the Employment Service Training Programs at Michigan State University, in lieu of a special training effort exclusively for rural manpower personnel.

Presently, we are cooperating in the development of a special training program to assist traditional farm-labor-oriented personnel in bridging the capability gap to become manpower development specialists with a special appreciation for the manpower problems in rural areas. Ultimately each State must develop that training program which fits the unique characteristics of its own situation. But there are some identifiable common characteristics or job skills which all rural manpower statesmen will have to have. They will have to know about employment counseling to

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

help the worker choose a suitable occupation; job training to enable the worker to learn new skills or upgrade present ability; and testing to help determine the right job for the worker. They will have to be familiar with all aspects of job placement, including selective placement service for veterans, youth, and workers displaced by technological changes. Although staff training will emphasize service to workers, attention will also be given to employer services and the collection and dissemination of rural labor market information.

One final thought on staff training is that it should teach our representatives awareness and sensitivity to the special needs of people with whom they may not easily communicate and give them an understanding of the barriers faced by many rural residents in achieving equality of access to public services. These barriers include language, race, inadequate transportation, lack of knowledge of services available, and diffidence in requesting service.

Conclusion

In conclusion, I can summarize our rural manpower strategy by saying that, within the limits of our resources, our goal is the elimination of the disparity between the quantity and quality of manpower services available to rural people as compared with nonrural people. We propose to reach this goal through a combination of established and innovative programs, a staff trained to be all-round rural manpower generalists, and cooperation with other agencies and private citizens engaged in trying to upgrade the rural environment.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Remarks By

DALE E. HATHAWAY

Professor of Agricultural Economics
Michigan State University

Before The

NATIONAL RURAL MANPOWER CONFERENCE

Atlanta, Georgia

Tuesday, January 19, 1971

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

THE MANPOWER CHALLENGE IN RURAL AREAS

I am pleased to be with you today to discuss some of the manpower problems of rural Americans. You have a commendable history as a farm labor service and now with an expanded responsibility, you face some of the greatest manpower problems in the country. However, you also have access to some of the greatest opportunities for program innovation that any sector of our public service faces. I will first discuss how some of these problems fit into a general national policy; secondly, review briefly the situation in rural areas; thirdly, touch lightly on the manpower needs in rural areas that are apparent from our limited information on the human problems in those areas, and finally, suggest some program needs that must be met.

At the present time, the United States Government does not have a comprehensive manpower policy. Instead, we have a series of manpower programs. While these in themselves can be good and helpful, we cannot really solve the major manpower problems in our economy without the development of a comprehensive manpower policy.

Its purpose should be to protect the well-being of individuals, not to maximize industrial production or even the gross national product. Such a policy must provide some clear goals on the following issues:

1. What is the desired geographical distribution of the population in the United States, and to what extent is the continued concentration of population desirable?

2. What kinds of goals do we wish to set for the minimum level and distribution of income in our society?

3. What is the desirable level of labor force participation in our economy relative to other methods of achieving our goals relating to the income distribution and to population distribution?

4. What division do we want between public and private sectors of the economy to provide the goods and services desired in the economy, and to what extent can we depend upon each to achieve the desired income and population distributions?

It is not my intent to propose such a comprehensive manpower policy here. I merely want to point out that the nature and extent of manpower services to rural areas, including employment services,

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

training programs, mobility assistance, family income plans, area development plans, housing programs, minimum wages, agricultural labor, and even agricultural crop production control programs all require a comprehensive policy in order to be effectively organized. However, recognizing that this is not likely in the immediate future, I would like to concentrate on certain manpower problems in the rural areas and some parts of the manpower programs that need attention.

I won't spend time defining rural areas. In general, I am concerned about that portion of the population which lives outside the influence of the larger major metropolitan areas, and depending upon the particular definition used, this includes between 50 and 75 million people.

These rural areas have suffered some of the greatest economic problems in the United States. They comprise about half of all those living in poverty, and the incidence there is higher than in all but the most dismal of our urban ghettos. These rural areas have the highest incidence of malnourishment, poor housing, and inadequate medical care found anywhere in our economy. But because of their relative invisibility, their lack of organization, and perhaps their lack of public outcry, the people there are all but ignored in our various government programs, including, unfortunately, most of our manpower programs. One indication of this is found in this quote from an unpublished Department of Labor working paper.

> "Overall, while 22 percent of the U. S. population lived in predominately rural counties, only 6.9 percent of labor and manpower outlays went to these counties. Measured in terms of concentration--expenditures share divided by corresponding population share--this means that rural counties received only 31 percent of labor and manpower funds that they might have expected based on their population (100 percent would indicate equality between the two). By contrast, outlays to metropolitan areas were much more concentrated: these areas received 85 percent of outlays even though their population share was 67 percent--indicating they received 27 percent more of the funds than their population share would suggest."

Unemployment, as we measure it in current statistics, does not appear to be a major problem in rural areas. Indeed the unemployment levels in rural areas tend to remain below the national average and well below the problem areas in inner cities. Rural areas tend to export many of their unemployed to urban areas in the form of unskilled, poorly educated migrants. For many rural people, being employed does not mean being productively employed at a level of return which provides a satisfactory economic situation. Rural areas have more working poor than has any large segment of our population due both to underemployment and to employment in the low wage occupations in our economy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

One reason for the relatively low incomes in rural areas is the serious under-investment in people in these areas. The evidence of this is widespread. Their years of school completed are well below the average of the labor force, especially in the South. Moreover, especially for the Negroes, expenditures per pupil and undoubtedly the quality of schooling in rural areas leave much to be desired. In addition, there is strong evidence that the labor market in rural areas operates differently than in metropolitan areas, and as a result, the economic fortunes of people in rural areas are different. Thus, there is some need for separate consideration of the rural areas for manpower services especially tailored to these particular problems.

At the present time, there is a fierce battle raging at both the intellectual and practical political levels as to whether economic development funds should go to our large urban areas or be more widely dispersed, including more attention to rural areas. The leaders of our large cities are desperate and rightfully so, given the problems they face. The leaders from rural areas have passed from desperation to frustration and the result often is no action for either group.

My analysis is that neither problem can be solved separately. They are similar and closely related. An examination of a significant number of research projects leads me to conclude that the labor market in rural areas has many of the same characteristics of those found in our large urban ghettos. Both areas have large numbers of low-income persons of labor force age who are either unemployed, seriously underemployed, or are holding low paying jobs. Neither group is advantageously located to the high-wage, growing industries. These are increasingly located in the fringes of larger cities and are not easily accessible to either ghetto dwellers or persons in rural areas more than 50 miles away. Both groups suffer from the disadvantages of inadequate formal education and are lacking in salable skills in the modern labor market. Both groups would benefit substantially from increased manpower services, but some basic policy questions, such as the following, must be answered before these can be organized.

1. Should we move people to jobs or jobs to people?

This question is perhaps the most basic policy issue in considering manpower services to rural people. The literature on this subject is extensive and professional opinions are deeply divided. One group assumes that locations of economic growth are divinely determined and that the largest metropolitan areas have been rightly chosen. At the other extreme is a group that views the present problems of the large metropolitan areas as insoluble and asserts that we must avoid increasing them at any cost.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The answer, both in terms of long-run economic growth and practical politics, is that both our large urban areas and rural areas must receive attention; for in the absence of a balanced approach, a single emphasis will spell failure for both.

It is obvious that we must provide improved manpower services to the large urban areas. But this alone, no matter how effective, will not suffice. Unless greater attention is paid to rural areas, the urban areas will be swamped with rural migrants moving into already overcrowded conditions. Moreover, too little attention is given to the downward spiral of economic and social systems generated in rural areas by a steady out-migration of the community's young. It generates a decline in other economic activities which might otherwise survive with a better population balance. Moreover, it generates an age structure which increasingly separates rural and urban areas in terms of values, productivity, and social structure.

The political realities are related to these factors. Rural people know they are poor and are receiving less than their share of Federal services. Political support in rural areas for a continuation of these programs is unlikely as long as the maldistribution continues. Within many rural communities the skewed age structure reduces support for local services such as schools.

My conclusion is that a policy of single emphasis is unlikely to be viable on either an economic or political basis. Even if this appraisal is valid, it does not void the need for a more carefully delineated Federal policy relative to the desired balance in the location of economic growth in the United States.

2. What services will most benefit rural people?

Part of the answer to this question depends upon the formulation of the locational aspects of the manpower problem. Leaving this aside, however, it appears that several needs are obvious.

First, since public schools in rural areas are heavily dependent upon local real estate taxes, generally upon farm land, and upon industries that often are already marginal, some method of financing improved schools in rural areas must be found. Bevins calculated that in the rural-urban migration from 1940-50, the investment in the education of rural young people who subsequently migrated to urban areas exceeded the total Federal subsidies to farming. Present financing methods thus amount to a substantial investment by poor rural areas in persons destined, in many cases, to spend their productive working years (and pay their taxes) in the wealthier areas of the country.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

This process may appear favorable to the urban areas were it not for the fact that if the rural education is inadequate, the urban areas may end up with large numbers of migrants who are poorly prepared for urban life and employment. This creates serious economic and social problems for the receiving areas. It is in the interest of both rural and urban areas, therefore, to shift away from the primarily local financing of public schools and to insure greater equalization of educational opportunity prior to entering the labor force. Once the educational pattern is set, it is much more expensive and less effective to attempt to overcome basic deficiencies via remedial education and special training. Moreover, the existence of good schools in these rural areas would help provide a labor force more attractive to industries when considering location, and make rural areas more attractive for the executive groups so important in determining industrial location.

A second vital need in rural areas is for trained personnel to work with local leaders in manpower planning and learning how to use the multitude of Federal programs related to these problems. Much of the allocation of current manpower programs toward richer urban areas is not the result of conscious Federal policy, but due to the sheer inability of areas lacking trained planning personnel to submit organized plans and projects which qualify for Federal assistance and to the complete lack of knowledge on the part of local rural government officials as to what assistance is available.

There is not a shortage of Federal personnel in most rural areas. Most of them, however, are employees of the Department of Agriculture, and because of lack of training and restricted agency missions, they do not normally perform this function.

The third service needed by rural people is an effective delivery system of the employment services in rural areas. Moreover, as I shall point out later, this concept needs to be expanded to include employment possibilities outside local communities. The report on the Ottumwa Experimental Project suggests that there can be an effective delivery of manpower services to rural areas.[1/] Another manpower service needed in rural areas is in retraining. A recent study in rural north central areas by Konyha suggested both the possibilities and limitations of retraining.[2/] His conclusions were:

1/ Breakthrough in Rural Manpower Services, Final Report of the Ottumwa, Iowa Experimental and Development Project (Ottumwa, Iowa: Iowa Employment Security Commission, January 1969).

2/ Marvin E. Konyha, Needs and Potentials for Escape from Poverty Through Retraining for Families in the Eastern Corn Belt, Ph.D. thesis, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan, 1970.

 BEST COPY AVAILABLE

"Perhaps the most critical implications of this study are those concerning the role that job retraining cannot play in eliminating rural poverty in this subregion. (Italics mine.) The 37 percent of the low income individuals considered to have no potential for economic viability can only be removed from the poverty category by social welfare-oriented rather than work-oriented programs. They will, for the most part, require some form of income supplements.

. . . . .

"Among the potentially economically viable respondents, approximately 50 percent were found to need job retraining but expressed no interest in participating in retraining programs. While many of these were wives of men who would be retrained, half the males also expressed no interest in retraining. This segment of the rural poor presents an urgent challenge to antipoverty program administrators to develop innovative approaches to solving poverty problems.

. . . . .

"Finally, innovative types of delivery systems need to be developed to provide retraining and employment opportunities for those low income individuals who are not living within commuting distance of employment centers.

. . . . .

"On the basis of retraining potentials developed in this study, retraining program administrators can be assured that sufficient numbers of rural, poverty level workers are interested in participating in, and have good potentials for completing, regular MDTA type retraining programs. On the other hand, if retraining is going to give first priority to the most needy of the rural poor, then much more effort will have to be exerted in providing basic educational instruction, as well as vocational training.

. . . . .

"Although this study focused only on educational level as a measure of potential for retraining success, past experience with retraining 'hardcore' individuals indicates that a complete package of services--counseling, health, placement, follow-up--are also required to insure their successful retraining. The same would undoubtedly apply to the rural poor with the least potential for success in retraining as measured here."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

A final and most important service needed is an information and assistance program to rationalize migration from rural areas. Whatever the national policy decision as to location of employment, some physical migration of workers will be required. The present system seems to operate almost exclusively upon informal information and communication systems, and it is surprising that it works as well as it does, which is not very well at all.

At a minimum this mobility assistance service system should provide:

1. Accurate information on job opportunities, living conditions, and potential costs and gains in alternative locations.

2. A single information contact point for migrants at both the exit and entry points in the migration. These should include information on social services available at entry points. A study of migrants to Cleveland shows that migrants make significantly less use of social services than do long-time residents of the same areas.

3. A financial assistance program for migrants, probably in the form of loans. If migration actually pays the individual, this portion of the cost should be borne by the individual. As it is, too much of the total social cost of migration is external to the individual, tending to over-value the gains from migration.

3. Where should these services be provided?

Despite many arguments to the contrary, these services can only be effective if they are delivered where the people are now. Many assert that training programs can only be "efficient" in the cities where the people come to work. Efficient for whom, the trainees or trainers? This reasoning excludes those who for one reason or another don't go to those cities and guarantees that rural areas have no opportunity to attract new sources of employment. The same can be said about counseling and unemployment services operating only in city receiving points for rural migrants.

In terms of employment expansion the answer is obvious if rural areas are to be aided. Investments must be in areas reasonably close to where people are located. This does not mean that public investment in every rural area would represent the best allocation of national resources. Certain areas having potential as growth centers for surrounding rural areas must be delineated and then we must have the political courage to channel the bulk of the developmental funds

to these areas. Once this is done, it would be possible for the Department of Labor and State agencies to develop comprehensive manpower programs connecting these centers with surrounding rural areas. The challenge you face will be tremendous. I wish you every success in your new and exciting role.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PLENARY SESSION: ARTIFICIAL BARRIERS TO EMPLOYMENT --RECOGNIZING CULTURAL DIFFERENCES

National Rural Manpower Conference--1971

Chairman:
William L. Heartwell, President, Interstate Conference of Employment Security Agencies

Speakers:
Dr. Charles Layba, California State College, Los Angeles
W.E. McIntosh, Principal Chief, Creek Nation, Tulsa, Oklahoma
Thomas Turner, President, Metropolitan Detroit AFL-CIO

This session was devoted to a discussion of minority cultures and the way in which cultural differences present a barrier to employment. The three speakers were, themselves, members of minority groups. Dr. Layba presented the culture of the Mexican Americans, Mr. McIntosh outlined the employment problems of Indians, and Mr. Turner discussed the barriers affecting blacks.

Language was said to be a barrier to employment. Many Spanish Americans and Indians do not speak English. Blacks are familiar with their own vernacular and may not understand expressions used by middle class whites. Also, employers tend to judge everyone according to the standards of their own culture and do not appreciate that a person from a different culture may have a different standard of values.

In planning manpower programs for minority groups, the speakers urged participation by members of minority groups who could sensitize other staff members to cultural differences. The following is a summary of the speakers' remarks.

Charles Layba

The general assumption that there is a commonality of interests and purpose among people tends to mask individual differences and differences between ethnic groups. The Mexican American community shares a common language, religion, and historical heritage which differentiates it from other cultures in this country. It is not easy for an Anglo to understand the Mexican American's goals, aspirations, or standard of values. In designing manpower programs to meet the needs of Mexican Americans, I recommend that the following be incorporated into the plan:

1. Mexican Americans should be involved in the program planning. A program should be responsive to the needs as they are perceived by Mexican Americans.

2. Set a time limit on achieving objectives. Without a deadline, there is always the possibility that objectives will never be met.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

3. There should be a program audit. By this I do not mean a fiscal audit, but rather an evaluation of accomplishment to see how well the program is actually meeting the needs of the target group.

W.E. McIntosh

Among the conditions of acute hardship that exist in Indian communities are high unemployment, lack of opportunities, and lack of loan capital to finance individual and tribal development of economic and natural resources. Following the westward press of so-called "civilization," the Indians finally wound up being pushed into those areas that had the worst land. On most of it you could "hardly raise an umbrella."

Indian community conditions are too readily accepted without being fully understood or appreciated. The result is that non-Indians are insensitive to the Indians' needs as well as in all other dealings with them.

I recommend that an overall decentralization of industry to rural areas be encouraged. If some plants were relocated in Indian communities, it would provide needed employment for Indians, help stabilize them in their home communities, and enable them to carry out their own programs for community development, economic growth, and self-sufficiency.

Thomas Turner

Cultural differences have been a barrier to employment of blacks, particularly if we look at employment in its broadest sense to include job security, advancement and promotion, working conditions, and other aspects in addition to the mere fact of giving a person some work to do.

Most white people do not really understand black people and most don't even really try. This gap in understanding is a barrier to satisfactory employment of blacks because most of the standards are white standards.

The Rural Manpower Service might take a page from the industries book. Increasingly companies hold classes to instruct supervisors on the difference between the background and culture of blacks and whites and the necessity of understanding the person in the light of that background rather than an inflexible standard. One example is the changes in the testing process--gearing tests so that the questions are phrased in the vernacular with which a person was brought up.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Blacks must honestly be made a part of the system and must be convinced that the Constitution and the Bill of Rights mean what they say and that the system will work for them. There must be a feeling of security and a sense of belonging.

In recent years, there has been some legislation to close the culture gap between the black and white people of America. It can be done more rapidly than one would think if we take positive and direct action to close it.

Manpower programs have come into being and people must know their aims and objectives. The poverty cycle cannot cure itself, but it can be cured. It must be cured by manpower agencies. In a democracy manpower never develops, but emerges. We have to look for the right formula.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PLENARY SESSION: BUSINESS MEETING AND PANEL DISCUSSION

National Rural Manpower Conference--1971

This meeting was devoted primarily to a discussion by Federal and State staff of business items such as budget, Plan of Service, time coding, ESARS, housing regulations, immigration procedures, legal actions, and FICRA.

Mr. Charles Becherer, the MA Comptroller, spoke on the accounting problems involved in producing a meaningful urban-rural break in activities. He instructed the States to charge the time as usual and leave it up to the Comptroller's Office to compute the rural-urban distribution.

Mr. Robert Pfeffer of the Office of the Associate Soliciter (Division of Manpower) answered questions from the floor as to the handling of law suits.

In the discussion of housing, the States were advised that they could do their own inspection for conformance with Federal standards.

During the discussion of the Farm Labor Contractor Registration Act, Mr. Jack Donnachie, Deputy Director of RMS, announced that at least 75,000 people are getting the benefits of this Act. He mentioned practical difficulties in getting court action against crew leaders who disobey the law.

Mr. Elton Cully of RMS exhibited a film which showed the work and leisure life of young tobacco field workers. This film, which was produced for RMS, is expected to help in the recruitment of tobacco workers.

A special feature of this meeting was a panel discussion on how to make the most effective use of available resources. The chairman of the panel was William U. Norwood, Jr., RMA Region IV. The other discussants were Lane Hart, Director of the ES Division, Mississippi Employment Security Commission and Joseph Kasper, RMS Director for Region V. Mr. Norwood advocated making the most efficient use of regular manpower programs and the resources of other agencies. Mr. Hart reported that training programs were accessible to almost every person in his State. He told what had been learned from building up the Mississippi program. Mr. Kasper presented a case history of a successful effort to build up interagency coordination. The following is a summary of their remarks.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

William Norwood

We will discuss what is possible under existing legislation and resources. While the urban offices have individualized, we continue to provide mass services in rural areas as we did for the farmworkers. But the rural needs are so great, it is impossible to meet all of them with our existing resources. What shall we do?

1. Make effective use of our existing staff. Go beyond the farm staff and consider the nonfarm staff.

2. Make more effective use of existing programs. We haven't done enough with MDTA institutional programs. There is no reason why the JOBS program cannot be used in rural areas. We need to know more about NYC, Mainstream, and mobility programs.

3. We need to work more closely with other agencies such as EDA, USDA, and the CAA's. CAMPS has not been as effective in rural areas as in urban areas.

Lane Hart

The Mississippi agency defines a rural area as any area not actively served by a full-functioning local office. The rural program is built on this concept.

Because our problem is a lack of jobs, the program is designed to move jobs in and people out. The Smaller Communities Team gathers the socioeconomic data that is required to run the program.

In the full-functioning local offices, we assign one individual to be responsible for a particular rural county and every resident of that county is referred to him.

Through CAPS or other agencies, we have been able to spread Mainstream, NYC, and other programs to all but six counties. Almost every person in the State is within commuting distance of a training center.

From our experience with rural manpower programs we have learned the following:

1. Progress in rural communities is slow.
2. Single shot efforts won't work.
3. Urban programs won't work. For example, day care centers are hard to work out. It is more effective to place a few children in a private home.
4. At the local office level, rural and urban programs cannot be separated.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Joseph Kasper

The most practical definition of a rural worker is one who lives beyond the scope of local office operations. Our goal is to provide him with the same service as an urban worker.

The guidelines set forth in GAL 1363 are flexible enough to allow the States to work out their own programs.

The problem of using staff to the best possible advantage is not difficult if you are willing to reduce some low priority activities. The RMS program is not a farm program; it is an ES program. We are going to take advantage of the ES staff. The RMS staff will identify the needs and arrange for ES services to be provided.

I would like to present a case history of interagency cooperation. The local office involved covered an eight-county area and had attempted to work with eight different welfare departments. They asked for referrals but received no response. A local office representative visited every welfare director and proposed joint staff meetings. At these meetings they talked to case workers about training opportunities and the development of employability plans. They sought advice on the types of training that should be provided. This resulted in a working partnership. Now they invite parole officers, vocational rehabilitation experts, and others. Here is an example of hitchhiking.

We aren't going to get more money, so let's substitute ingenuity.

WORKSHOP: AGRICULTURAL UNIONIZATION--IMPLICATIONS FOR WORKERS, EMPLOYERS, AND PUBLIC OFFICIALS

National Rural Manpower Conference--1971

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Discussion Leader:
Richard K. Klatt, Superintendent, Farm Labor, ES, New York.

Discussants:
William L. Kircher, Director of Organization, AFL-CIO.
Daryl Arnold, President, Free Marketing Council.
Boren Chertkov, Counsel, Senate Subcommittee on Migratory Labor.

This discussion was primarily a debate between Mr. Arnold and Mr. Kircher concerning events that transpired in the California lettuce industry in the summer of 1970. Mr. Arnold defended the growers' position in having invited the Teamsters union to represent the workers and attacked the United Farmworkers Organizing Committee for using the boycott. Mr. Kircher defended the boycott as the only means by which UFWOC could gain union recognition. While both speakers were blunt and forthright in their remarks, there were important elements of agreement between them. Both favored extending the National Labor Relations Act to farmworkers as a means of assuring that the worker's preference in regard to a union would be honored. Mr. Chertkov called attention to this agreement as evidence that some members of the employer community are taking a more enlightened view of NLRA coverage for farmworkers. Legislation in this regard will be considered by Congress this year. The following is a summary of the speakers' remarks.

William L. Kircher

Before discussing the impact of unionization on agricultural workers, I want to make sure that no one thinks I am presenting myself as any kind of objective expert. I am a professional union organizer... nothing more, nothing less. I am a protagonist in an extremely adversary proceeding.

I think the impact of unionism on agricultural workers will approximate the impact it had on every category of workers that have vigorously embraced it. It will improve them economically and culturally. It will alleviate the conditions which make their lives difficult today. A union is being built. It is being built by farmworkers for farmworkers and it is succeeding because it is led by farmworkers and participated in by farmworkers

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

I am opposed to the second-class status of citizenship inflicted upon agricultural workers when they were excluded from the so-called "Wagner Act". With no procedure under the law to effectuate a collective bargaining relationship with an employer, the farmworker must rely upon the employer to voluntarily recognize his union or devise ways and means to make recognition of that union the least offensive of the alternatives a grower faces.

Normally one would think of the strike as the organizational weapon. Yet the strike in agriculture, especially in areas near the Mexican border, has proved completely ineffective. Thus the farmworker turns to the boycott where, in effect, he asks those in the national community to help him by refusing to buy the commodities of those producers who are frustrating organizational efforts.

Much that will happen, therefore, from an organizational point of view is going to be determined by the employer community and the degree to which it continues its bitter resistance practices of the past.

Now I am going to talk about recent developments in employee-employer relations in the lettuce-producing areas of California. The involved groups are the United Farmworkers Organizing Committee, AFL-CIO; the growers; and the Teamsters union. Do not be alarmed that the absence of the Teamsters will work hardship on their point of view. Mr. Arnold will do an energetic job of presenting it.

In July 1970, when UFWOC finally had all major fresh grape growers under contract, the union decided to turn its attention to the lettuce industry, because this crop had the strongest membership outside of the grape industry. Early in July, the union sent demands for recognition to the lettuce growers stating that UFWOC represented their workers and was prepared to prove it. But on July 29, it was announced that the lettuce growers had signed contracts with the Teamsters.

Following this announcement, UFWOC reached an agreement with the Teamsters that the latter would grant recisions to growers with whom they had signed contracts in July 1970 if and as the growers asked for them. So the farmworkers struck and boycotted to force these companies to request recisions. Now UFWOC is fully geared for a national lettuce boycott, while the growers are tenaciously holding to their 5-year back-door contracts. The Teamsters union has indicated an open willingness to withdraw from all of the contracts which were not in existance prior to July 1970--and that is about 188 out of 190--which leaves two which are claimed to have existed prior to July 1970. This is where the major areas of interunion conflict now exists. UFWOC'S position is that the Antle contract in effect before 1970 did not cover all types of workers.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Daryl Arnold

The issue is really a fight between two unions--the Teamsters, a legitimate union covered by the National Labor Relations Act, and the UFWOC, which is not bound by the Act and can, therefore, use the boycott. UFWOC is trying to force workers to join by using the boycott against their employers. Workers should have a chance to vote by secret ballot indicating whether or not they want a union to represent them and, if so, what union.

I will outline some of the provisions of UFWOC contracts to show why no employer would want to sign a contract with them:

1. The union has the right to have a foreman fired if he speaks against the union. This takes away his freedom of speech and every other freedom I know of.

2. The hiring halls are sometimes located as far as 30 miles from the worker's residence.

3. Most contracts give the employer 30 days to decide if the worker is qualified. The UFWOC contract doesn't give him 5 minutes.

4. While there should be a health and safety clause, I don't think the union has the right to tell the employer what pesticides to use.

5. UFWOC requires the employer to make available all information in regard to how the product is shipped. This is unrelated to collective bargaining.

As long as the secondary boycott is permitted, it is impossible to have a fair contract. I advocate having agricultural workers included under the National Labor Relations Act.

Boren Chertkov

For many years, the cry of the farmworkers fell on deaf ears. Now, for the first time, they have achieved enough power to have their dispute aired publicly. The employer's total opposition to organization is beaking down. Mr. Arnold's position is more enlightened than the old position.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Proposals for NLRA coverage have never gotten very far in the past, but this year, two will be put in legislative form and will be considered by Congress. One (S8) would provide for NLRA coverage without qualifications. The other is the proposal of former Labor Secretary Schultz which provides for certain qualifications.

Because the Senate Subcommittee on Migratory Labor is concerned about the powerlessness of agricultural workers, it is investigating industrial relations in California agriculture. It is looking into such problems as the border commuters, the use of harmful pesticides, the Defense Department's purchases of lettuce, and problems associated with large corporate farm enterprises.

Question and Answer Period

Mr. Arnold was asked if he supported NLRA coverage without qualification. He stated that he favored a special board, within the Department of Labor, to implement the law as it affected agriculture rather than implementation by the National Labor Relations Board. He favored no other qualifications.

Questioned about the official position of the AFL-CIO, Kircher reported it favored S8, even though the AFL-CIO has not been completely happy with NLRA'S implementation of the law. He made it clear that each union is autonomous and would not necessarily support the official AFL-CIO position. Arnold claimed that UFWOC opposed NLRA coverage because the law would prevent this union from forcing workers to join by means of the boycott. Kircher countered that UFWOC was not the "outlaw union" that Arnold pictured it to be. It is a respectable union with the full support of the AFL-CIO, according to Kircher.

A farm employer objected to both unions. "The grower is being chopped up by real pros," he claimed. "While they're fighting, we're going broke."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

WORKSHOP: NEW APPROACHES FOR ORGANIZING THE DELIVERY OF MANPOWER SERVICES

National Rural Manpower Conference--1971

Chairman:
Neil Cooper, Assistant Chief of Farm Labor and Rural Manpower Service, ES, Michigan.

Discussants:
Dr. B. Eugene Griessman, Chairman, Department of Sociology, Auburn University.
Dr. Maurice Voland, Rural Sociologist, University of Kentucky.
William Hood, Rural Manpower Specialist, Rural Manpower Service, U.S. Department of Labor.

Because of the wide dispersion of the rural population, providing adequate manpower services to isolated communities is a costly undertaking. This workshop was devoted primarily to discussing innovative approaches to overcoming this problem. Dr. Griessman described Concerted Services in Training and Education, a program which combines the advantages of Federal sponsorship and local autonomy. Dr. Voland presented Operation Hitchhike, a program for reaching remotely located counties through the help of the County Extension Service or other agencies that have established offices in these counties. A third approach, the Ottumwa project, was presented by Mr. Hood. This provides for organizing a hierarchy of local offices within a multicounty area. Outpost offices do outreach work and perform general services under the direction of a full-functioning office at the center of the area where specialized services are available. Finally, Mr. Cooper discussed a Michigan proposal for using existing rural manpower staff to set up service units in 31 counties which have been receiving little or no manpower service. The following is a summary of the speakers' remarks.

B. Eugene Griessman

The Concerted Services in Training and Education Projects (CSTE) provide a means by which the manpower resources which Federal agencies can offer are channeled to the individual county. During the 3 years when I was associated with an evaluation of CSTE conducted by the University of North Carolina, I had occasion to discuss the projects with many people in the counties where the projects were conducted. The reactions I encountered were favorable. The strength of CSTE is that it

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

combines the best features of local autonomy with the advantages of Federal sponsorship, as follows:

1. The concept is one of community involvement--the people, local organizations, and local agencies.

2. The concept revolves around a local person working through local agencies and allowing these agencies to get the credit for success.

3. The coordinator is given a broader perspective and is able to see the whole picture in the community.

4. The program stresses that the coordinator must have a knowledge of what resources are available and how to get them.

5. The coordinator is insulated from petty local pressures.

6. The coordinator is rewarded for being innovative--something unique in a bureaucracy.

7. Also unique in a bureaucracy is the fact that CSTE legitimizes crossing departmental boundaries.

This type of approach is hard to beat.

Maurice Voland

With limited ES personnel available to deliver manpower services in rural areas, it seems only logical to consider the use of other existing rural structures and institutions to assist in service delivery. Dr. Hathaway has recommended the development of a contractual relationship with the Cooperative Extension Service. While several other institutions are providing services to rural areas, they lack the advantages provided by this agency. The Extension Service has a professional staff in nearly all of the more than 3,000 counties in the United States; it makes use of viable "grass roots" advisory bodies; and its basic mission is to enhance the quality of living throughout rural America. Integrated into a local and State government, it could provide the institutional vehicle upon which the MA could hitchhike in order to reach many rural people.

To test the potential for developing this type of arrangement, the Department of Labor will contract with several State ES agencies to establish pilot programs in collaboration with the Cooperative Extension Service.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

A Manpower Unit in a county or area office of the Extension Service would help to sensitize the regular personnel concerning manpower needs. It would also perform such functions as the following: (1) reach out to individuals needing manpower services and refer them to the ES; (2) assist ES in its regular activities; (3) help employers evaluate their manpower needs; (4) evaluate the manpower needs of the area; (5) make community leaders more aware of manpower needs; (6) provide data on significant changes in labor supply and demand; (7) help develop manpower training proposals; and (8) distribute manpower publications.

It is contemplated that the State employment security agency will contract with the State Cooperative Extension Service to supplement ES efforts in rural areas by performing the functions outlined in this paper.

William Hood

The fundamental objective of the Ottumwa approach is to create a method of delivery capable of providing rural residents with access to manpower services comparable with that enjoyed by urban residents. It involves the creation of an apparatus capable of carrying these expanded and strengthened services to employers and applicants located in the most remote parts of the rural community. It requires the full utilization of all the various technical competences found in the State-Federal employment security complex. In urban areas, the resource depth for delivery either existed or was found, but in rural areas, it did not exist. Low population density rendered impossible the addition of sufficient staff resources to permit delivery of these services through each of the several small operating units.

The Ottumwa approach is an attempt to make those changes occurring in the social and economic environment an aid in service delivery. One change, documented by Dr. Karl Fox, has been the evolution of the extended social and economic community. Referred to as a Functional Economic Area, such a community exhibits the characteristics of an orgainzed economic layout and its residents tend to identify themselves as members of the community. The Census has applied this area concept nationwide. (See Working Paper No. 28, U.S. Bureau of the Census.)

The Ottumwa approach is a logical consequence of applying the FEA concept to ES organization and operations. It involves the following elements: (1) the creation of a single organization serving the entire area; (2) utilization of some type of Job Bank concept; (3) development of staff expertise in such technical areas as counseling, labor market information interpretation, etc; (4) the further decentralization of applicant and employer outreach; and (5) utilization of community resources in employer and applicant development activities.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

A model would consist of an area office, presumably located in the dominant city, one or more field offices which would operate full time, and an indefinite number of part-time outstation or outreach points, all presided over by the area manager.

Neil Cooper

Increasing demands from several Michigan areas resulted in the formation of a Rural Manpower Task Force in October 1970 to develop a plan to extend employment services to as many rural areas as feasible. The Plan was to specify (1) where staff would be obtained; (2) what budgeting, if any, would be required; and (3) how it would fit into the present organizational structure.

The Task Force studied local office locations and their personnel; Census statistics; areas in which WIN and CEP programs were operating; ADC, ADCU, and General Assistance caseloads in each county; and ES-202 statistics.

The study revealed that 31 counties were being furnished with minimal services or none whatsoever. It is with these counties that this proposal is concerned. It is proposed that Rural Areas Manpower service points be located in each of the 31 county seats. Twenty four positions have been obtained from the Farm Labor and Rural Manpower Service and two additional positions will be requested via a supplemental request. The 26 staff members will provide basic employment services including registration of job seekers, order taking, referral, placement, job development, and reporting. Employability development must be furnished by the nearest local offices or by area counselors on an itinerant basis. Also service points will provide training slots for work experience program trainees.

All service points will eventually be provided with Job Bank "books" and will be informed of training opportunities. Each service point will be expected to develop cooperative arrangements with other agencies in the county seat.

Each service point will be under the supervision of a Rural Areas Supervisor who will be directly responsible to the Assistant Chief of the Farm Labor and Rural Manpower Service. The Area Supervisor will be responsible for developing local interest in the Rural Areas Manpower service point. State office personnel will asist in the promotional program.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Question and Answer Period

Speakers from the floor volunteered information on what is being done to further economic development in their States. A group called "Texas Communities Tomorrow" has a program similar to Concerted Services. Operating on a $12 million grant from HUD, they are choosing communities for economic development assistance on the basis of need and the willingness of local people to work on development problems. TEC is assisting by supplying a Smaller Communities team. Similar activities are occurring in Georgia, Iowa, Nebraska, and Kentucky.

Mr. Walter Parker of Illinois called attention to the disparity between the resources provided to the big cities and the rural areas. He suggested that this disparity be called to the attention of rural Congressman and that they be urged to work for more adequate manpower resources for rural areas.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

WORKSHOP: RURAL MANPOWER STAFF DEVELOPMENT

National Rural Manpower Conference--1971

Discussion Leader:
Floyd McGlinn, Rural Manpower Supervisor, Oregon Employment Service.

Discussants:
Dr. Louis Levine, Pennsylvania State University.
Joseph Julianelle, Director, Office of Technical Assistance and Training, USTES, USDL.

Changes in the organization and operation of the Rural Manpower Service require a reorientation and retraining of staff. This workshop was devoted to a discussion of what should be done to prepare staff members to assume a new role. Dr. Levine's remarks dealt with the changes that will have an impact on the kind of training required. Mr. Julianelle presented the Manpower Administration's plans for training programs. The following is a summary of the speakers' remarks.

Louis Levine

The 1960-1970 decade was characterized by a shift of emphasis by the Employment Service to the urban poor or disadvantaged person. Legislation and resulting programs were directed toward improving employability. This concept required a change of attitude in local offices which was a difficult task in the early years of the decade.

Previously, the marginal worker was not welcomed nor did he care to go to the local office, fearing discrimination or rejection. Programs of the last decade were social and economic in design whereas development of a labor supply was the chief goal of prior programs. The new concept was revolutionary because priority was given to a specific group, the urban poor.

The real test of an employability program is employment itself. With this realization in the late 1960's, programs were initiated to get people into jobs. The JOBS and OJT Programs were developed at this time. These programs are being severely tested now because of the unfavorable labor market. Consequently, these and other manpower programs are under critical review.

The Rural Manpower Service is currently undergoing the revolutionary change which the Employment Service experienced earlier. Consequently, the staff must expand its perspective, obtain more formal education, communicate and work with community institutions, and develop competence but at the same time maintain the common touch. Two big problems in rural areas are dislocation and mobility. After World War II some 400,000 displaced persons from

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

our farms were ignored while diligent efforts were made to aid displaced persons in Europe. The Farm Labor Service was essentially a placement-dominated organization geared to short-term grower requirements. Under the Rural Manpower Service, farm labor activities will represent only a small part of overall programs.

In his new role, the rural manpower representative will devote more time to organizing his work and to communicating with professional people. Emphasis will be on the rural nonfarm segment of the population and counseling youth on how to prepare to work and live in rural America. Counseling will go beyond what it is today--mainly advising stranded migrant families. The rural manpower representative will need to learn more about employers, establishments, unions, training programs, etc. The Rural Manpower Service must provide career development and new orientation for the whole staff.

Joseph Julianelle

An estimated 85,000 Federal, State, and local staff persons are working to implement manpower programs in this country. In the past, little funding was available for coordinated training of staff people. However, this situation was changed in 1970 when the Manpower Development and Training Act was amended, with Section 309 providing 2 percent of the funds ($13,000,000) for technical assistance and training.

Under this new MDTA provision, plans are being developed to establish one national and three regional manpower staff training centers in 1971. The goal is to establish centers in all 10 regions within the next 3 years.

The centers will be operated primarily by Manpower Administration staff, and the program will probably include workshops, seminars, and conferences, as well as monitoring and research activities.

Each center will have an audio-visual section, and each center will be open to Federal-State manpower staff persons whether in rural or urban programs. A package is being developed now to train rural manpower specialists.

Question and Answer Period

Mr. Julianelle was asked where the three regional training centers would be located. He replied that there would be one on the east coast, one in the midwest, and one in the west. The exact locations have not been decided. If more resources become available, more centers will be set up.

It was suggested that the Labor Department join with other agencies to provide a unified training program. Mr. Julianelle felt this was not the orientation the Labor Department was after. However, representatives of other agencies will participate in training. He noted that the plans of the Office of Technical Assistance and Training are still in the developmental phase and

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

the agency is looking for a strategy for training RMS personnel.

A delegate from Delaware mentioned that the Civil Service requirements for a counselor are outdated. He urged that they be changed to conform to today's requirements.

Mr. Levine called attention to the significance of the conversion of the rural economy from a farm to a nonfarm orientation. Finding a worker to pick cherries is not the same as giving service to an employer who wants to retain a worker for many years. Our reorientation program should take this into consideration.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

WORKSHOP: PROMOTING INVOLVEMENT AND INTERAGENCY COORDINATION

National Rural Manpower Conference--1971

Chairman:
Leo Forrester, Assistant Chief of Farm Placement, ES, New Jersey.

Discussants:
Dr. Alfred Edwards, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Rural Development and Conservation, USDA.
David T. Duncan, Assistant to Governor Milliken, Michigan.
Richard Hobson, Office of Education, HEW.
John Costionas, Manpower Branch, OPD-OEO.

The speakers at this workshop felt that an affluent economy such as that of the United States, has an obligation to minister to the needs of its poor, including the rural poor. The needs of a rural family living in poverty are multifold and require coordinated efforts at assistance. No single agency can solve the problems of rural poverty without help.

Dr. Edwards described the U.S. Department of Agriculture's organized network for promoting interagency cooperation. Mr. Duncan outlined the requirements for a successful coordinative structure based on Michigan's experience. Mr. Hobson described the kind of cooperation that a training agency needs from other agencies. Mr. Costionas described some outstanding examples of successful interagency coordination. The following summarizes the speakers' remarks.

Alfred Edwards

Our gross national product will increase by five hundred billion dollars in the next 10 years, greater than the entire American economy growth from 1790 to 1950. The question is how we will use that growth. At issue is the effectiveness of government. The consequences of ineffectiveness are all around us. Cities have become overburdened and much of the countryside has been abandoned. The change has been costly in terms of human worth and production.

The Department of Agriculture has organized a network for rural development involving all its employees and imposing a mandate for effective liaison. In Washington, the Rural Development Committee is composed of representatives from the FHA, Extension Service, Soil Conservation Service, Forest Service, REA, and the Economic Research Service--all concerned with rural area development and improvement. Each of these agencies or services is responsible for

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

determining appropriate liaison with other agencies and departments on a similarity of program basis.

USDA rural development committees have been created in each State. They are responsible for liaison and cooperation with State and local governments and other appropriate organizations dealing with rural problems and welfare.

Much better information about rural manpower is vital if industry is to be encouraged to locate in rural areas. This conference should help find the answer to obtaining and disseminating the kind of information needed.

David T. Duncan

A need for coordination exists by virtue of the large number of so-called coordinative advisory bodies which have been required during the last decade as a result of manpower-related legislation and/or rules and procedures. Most of our advisory bodies, and consequently our interagency cooperative efforts, suffer from two significant weaknesses. First, there is such a proliferation of programs, agencies, and advisory bodies that they presently get in each other's way. Second, most coordinative bodies have the responsibility to coordinate imposed by some regulation, while in fact they have no substantive control over program and/or agency funding. The ability to coordinate, by and large, is directly proportional to the degree of control which the coordinative body has over the purse strings of the agencies to be coordinated. Therefore, we must provide the coordinative body with the responsibility for approving the expenditures of a significant portion of money from the budgets of the agencies whose services are to be coordinated.

We in Michigan have made the following assumptions related to manpower planning policy and programming:

1. The coordinative body must include a comprehensive representation of all relevant bodies. A comprehensive structure is needed to provide a workable vehicle for coordinating manpower planning and service delivery.

2. Rural and urban manpower problems are so closely related that it is unwise to separate them.

3. Although there are some similarities between rural and urban manpower problems, there are also differences in specific areas of the State.

4. Some program funding control is necessary for the coordination of manpower--or any--service delivery.

5. Agencies will, as a rule, work cooperatively only when it is evident that to do so is to their advantage.

6. The coordinative body should not be duplicative in its functions.

 BEST COPY AVAILABLE

7. The coordinative body should have an effective appeals mechanism, providing a means to question the actions of the group.

8. Any coordinative body must have a data base which is adequate and up to date.

9. In establishing a coordinative body, the roles that the members are expected to play must be recognized.

10. For a State coordinative body to function, there should be local and/or regional subunits with coordinative bodies relating to and working with the State-level organization.

With these thoughts in mind, the Governor of Michigan established the Michigan Manpower Commission. It consists of two committees: (1) A Policy Advisory Committee composed of individuals from business, industry, labor, the universities, and the minorities; and (2) the State CAMPS Committee, composed of Federal and State program directors who are in a position to influence agency policies and action.

The Policy Advisory Committee recommends long-range policy to the Governor and State agencies. The CAMPS Committee allocates discretionary manpower resources and studies short-range, immediate types of problems. At present, the latter has an executive committee and subcommittees on the following: rural manpower, urban manpower, minority group problems, health manpower, public service career programs, youth programs, and allocation and operations.

We believe that, with strong technical assistance, local problems can best be described and resolved at the local level. We believe it is mandatory to develop a single local planning, evaluative, and coordinative body within each local area.

The State CAMPS Committee allocates resources considering both the need described and the solutions which appear most sound. A base program figure is developed for each area, based on indicators such as unemployment, welfare recipients, dropouts, agency service plans and projected number of candidates in need of manpower services.

To assist State agencies, the State Committee, and area committees in planning for manpower needs, the Governor implemented a Manpower Planning Project. The first three phases were directed toward the development of statistical projection tables depicting Michigan's prime candidates for manpower services, by age and sex, for each year between 1970 and 1980. These manpower services, simply defined, are those services that will enable people capable of being employed to obtain and keep employment. I find it difficult to see how any State can effectively plan to provide comprehensive manpower service, over a period of time, to persons in need of such services without this kind of data.

I am personally convinced that those factors which I have mentioned in this paper must be considered if a meaningful coordinative structure is to be developed.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Richard Hobson

Interagency coordination is of prime importance because manpower services cannot be delivered successfully to the rural poor unless coordination is successful. The existence of a mechanism does not guarantee effective coordination. Many mechanisms exist on paper--CAMPS, Concerted Services, Rural Development Committees, Federal Interdepartmental Task Force, etc. The overriding consideration is, of course, how viable these mechanisms are for achieving the kind of involvement and interagency coordination needed to have a successful impact on the rural poor.

Another essential is commitment. Is the Federal Government, including the American people, ready to release the massive resources needed? This would entail a dramatic change in social attitudes.

As an advocate of the rural poor, the Department of Agriculture lacks the necessary people orientation. OEO has demonstrated sensitivity but is sometimes stifled by political realities.

In order for the Office of Education and the Labor Department to train and place workers successfully, there needs to be cooperation from other agencies in economic development, housing, health, and welfare assistance.

A nation with a trillion dollar GNP and other indications of affluence can and must find a way to enhance the life of the rural poor.

John Coptionna

Our agency has studied various rural poverty programs and published a report. This investigation has revealed some good examples of how a rural poverty can be conducted successfully.

The project conducted at Cherokee Hills, Oklahoma, by the Soil Conservation Service is an outstanding example of interagency coordination. In Mississippi and Louisiana, projects have been conducted in cooperation with the Forestry Service to develop programs for the rural poor in producing pulpwood. The workers were taught business management, so they worked for themselves and earned more than they would have from wages. A great many people were placed on jobs in a project conducted in central Virginia. The employer provided transportation, and various agencies provided supportive assistance.

These examples show that successful program efforts can be achieved if good working relationships can be developed among the various agencies involved.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Question and Answer Period

A delegate pointed out that the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized by law to step in and administer the Food Stamp Program in a given State under certain circumstances. He asked why the Secretary didn't do this in States where migrants are not adequately helped by the State administrator. Edwards replied that if the Secretary did this in one State, he would have to do it in all States that serve migrants. Hobson pointed out that this was an example of how political realities interfere with meeting the needs of the rural poor. He cited examples to show that the Department of Agriculture, HEW, OEO are aware of certain weaknesses in their services and are making efforts to overcome these weaknesses.

Edwards mentioned that the Department of Agriculture could do more for rural people if it had authority to do so. For example, it could provide housing for MDTA trainees, but has no appropriation for this purpose. He was asked about USDA reaction to Hitchhike. He replied that the reaction was favorable.

Mr. Mock of MA Region V reported that an Interagency Coordinating Committee on Migrants had been set up by the Regional Interagency Council. Recently nine Chicano members have been added to this committee which originally consisted of representatives of nine Federal agencies. This committee has functioned very successfully and has recently submitted 50 long-range recommendations to the Council.

Mr. Duncan pointed out how this discussion illustrated the fact that no single agency can do what is needed for rural people.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SPECIAL MEETING: MIGRANT EXPERIMENTAL AND DEMONSTRATION PROJECT

National Rural Manpower Conference--1971

Discussion Leader:
C. Fred Metzler, Director, Migrant E&D Project.

Discussants:
Joaquin Hernandez, Project Coordinator, Ontario, Oregon.
Richard Mock, Regional Office Coordinator, Chicago.
Delia Vorhauer, Project Coordinator, Ohio,
Glenn Olsen, Project Coordinator, Idaho.
Ray Bozeman, Regional Office Coordinator, Dallas.
Charles Routhe, Project Director, Minnesota.

After completing a second year's experience with the Migrant Experimental and Demonstration Project, the participating States and regions had built up a considerable body of expertise which they were willing to share with others attending the conference. The speakers told of what they had learned from their own experiences with various facets of the project. Mr. Metzler opened the discussion by sketching in brief how the project was organized and implemented. Mr. Hernandez and Mr. Mock dealt with building up an interagency coordination system for the delivery of supportive services. Mr. Hernandez described coordination at the local level as it was done in Ontario, Oregon. Mr. Mock described coordination at the regional level as it was done in Region V. Mrs. Vorhauer presented ideas on developing manpower services for migrants. Mr. Olsen and Mr. Bozeman considered various aspects of settling out migratory families. Mr. Olsen described what a demand State had done to help migrants fit into entry level nonfarm jobs. Mr. Bozeman described what a supply State had done to give migrants vocational training and financial assistance in preparation for outsettlement. Mr. Routhe followed up with a talk on management and supervision which showed how organizational form should be designed to fit the State's characteristics and policies. The following is a summary of the speakers' remarks.

C. Fred Metzler, Jr.

The premise for the Migrant E&D Project was our concern over the consequences of the sharp drop in farm job opportunities for migratory workers. Our basic problem was what do for the thousands of workers that have been and are going to be, displaced--workers who possess only little education or marketable skills.

Our plan was to test various techniques for delivering manpower and supportive services by helping about 750 families from the Lower Rio Grande Valley of Texas who were going to specified work locations in northern States. Implementation of the plan relied heavily on the persons hired as Rural Outreach Interviewers (ROI'S). These were selected primarily for their understanding of the Mexican American culture and language. Many of them had been migrants. Their backgrounds were of value in gaining rapport with migratory families.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

In the spring, Texas ROI'S selected project families and identified their needs, forwarding the information to the northern target areas where the families planned to work. ROI'S in the north tried to contact the families to meet these needs, and forwarded the information to Texas for follow-up action in the fall. ROI'S in Texas and the northern States attempted to encourage families to settle out of the migratory stream.

Our plan for 1971 is to have the 10 project States absorb the promising elements of the E&D project into their regular operations.

Joaquin Hernandez

It is our purpose here to show that the Experimental and Demonstration Project is experimental in its approach and demonstrable in its results. In experimenting with supportive service delivery, we have borrowed from other scientific disciplines. For example, the field of medicine has long used the staff approach; we found that "staffing a case" enhanced the alternatives for supportive services.

A sine qua non for this experiment was outreach. Without it, we would bias our sample by serving only those with the time, the financial and transportation means, and the predisposition to come to us. Hence the importance of the Rural Outreach Interviewer. Our sample consisted of an experimental group of migrants selected for the E&D project and a control group of ex-migrants. Both groups received services.

Delivery of services presupposes their availability. In Oregon, this was made possible by the ROI'S by the on-going community services, and by special funding. Funds were made available by the E&D project itself, the Migrant Health Division, Vocational Rehabilitation, MDTA, and the County Commissioners.

In addition to on-going programs, the following services were inaugurated after the start of the E&D program in Ontario:

A. A legal aid clinic under the Malheur County Bar Association.

B. A child care center-brought to Oregon through the cooperation of the sponsor, the Colorado Migrant Council.

C. Valle del Tesoro Local Development Corporation, incorporated in the State of Oregon for the purpose of assisting migrants and ex-migrants to become self-employed.

D. The Interagency Committee for E&D which the E&D Project was instrumental in establishing.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The scientific method, as applied to adult basic education, requires that students be tested. Its value is demonstrated by the results of giving the GED test to 11 migrant high school dropouts. Three passed all five parts of the test and were ready to either apply for jobs or take vocational training. All passed at least one part of the test and could economize on training time.

The E&D project made every effort to maximize the availability of counseling. We trained POI'S to recognize counselling needs and to apply counseling techniques. We continued to provide further training as we staffed individual cases.

In addition to counseling and testing, the project provided such services as MDTA, adult basic education, employment-related services, supportive services, and follow-up visits.

Richard Mack

I have been asked for remarks on two subjects--interagency coordination and changing attitudes.

Early in 1970, the rural manpower staff of Region V developed interest in forming a migrant committee by discussing with other Federal agencies the severe problems that had begun to surface in the Region V States. This resulted in the decision of the Chicago Regional Council to form the Regional Interagency Migrant Coordinating Committee, composed of representatives of HUD, OEO, HEW, Transportation, Labor, Agriculture, and Defense. It was charged with preparing an emergency plan to be implemented in a crisis. The plan called for opening a portion of facilities at specified military bases for use as emergency rest stops and the expansion of housing, food, and medical facilities at other rest stops.

The Council also directed the committee to develop a long range plan for improving services to migrants through a coordinated Federal approach. It approved the committee's request to add nine Chicano migrant worker representatives. The committee divided into seven working subcommittees: Employment and Training, Housing, Food, Health, Welfare, Education, and Transportation. From subcommittee statements, the committee drew up a comprehensive report containing over 50 recommendations for actions to resolve migrant problems.

In my opinion, this work was worthwhile. Because of the interstate character of the migrant problem, the Federal government is responsible for assisting the States with it. Since migrancy results from searching for employment, the manpower agencies should play a leading role. The Region V States have become more aware of their responsibilities as a result of the E&D project.

This brings us to the second part of my talk concerning changing attitudes. Formerly, most staff members believed we had fulfilled our responsibilities if we helped the crew find a job. With the E&D project, thinking slowly began to change. In-depth interviews brought home to us the migrants' problems. As a result of this change in thinking, States are planning expanded migrant programs emphasizing "individualized" services.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

It is late, but not too late, to initate a nationwide program to aid migrants as they are forced to leave the migrant stream and settle out in search of employment and a better way of life.

Delia Vorhauer

Today we are faced with the tremendous challenge of meeting the manpower needs of the migrant worker. Without manpower services, we relegate the migrant to that cycle of dependency and desperation he already knows so well.

A job preserves the migrant's place in his family, preserves the family's place in society and overall, allows him to say, "I don't ask that you give me anything, just take me to where I can reach it for myself."

Only recently had the Employment Service attempted to serve those whose joblessness reflects interiorized disadvantages-the results of the victimization by a larger society. The migrant is a case in point. Historically, he has been the victim of economic slavery, ethnic discrimination, and educational starvation. All of these must be dealt with on the way to securing permanent job for the migrant worker.

To meet the manpower needs of migrants, the objective must be to incorporate migrant manpower services into the family of ES services. The agenda must include the following steps:

1. Employment Service personnel must be familiar with the population to be serviced. They must understand the economics of migration, accepting and respecting the migrant's rich cultural heritage, his values and ambitions. They must have a thorough understanding of the dynamics of the settling-out process.

2. Make adjustments to shape present programming into real training opportunities for the migrant worker.

3. There must be a vital and extensive program of affirmative outreach including publicity in Spanish on available services, bi-cultural liaison personnel, and staff visits to migrant gathering places.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

In addition to these basic activities, there are other important ways of implementing migrant manpower programs. First, always remember that language is not only the most vocational of all skills but its acquistion is basic to realizing other job potentials of the migrant applicant. Second, bring in the Mexican American technical expertise. There's plenty of it around. Ask for suggestions and follow through on recommendations.

Glenn Olsen

Idaho's FSD commitment for 1970 included a proposal to settle out about 30 additional families from the migratory stream. It is these families I would like to talk about.

It takes a high degree of involvement to properly appraise the need for services. From this involvement we uncovered such obvious problems as language, employment, transportation, housing, physical disabilities, etc. We also uncovered some not-so-obvious problems such as community acceptance, certain health problems, recreational outlets, money management, educational attainment, and ultimate aspirations.

We feel that the distance between migrancy and mainstream America must be bridged by way of steps up the job ladder. We advocate jobs as the pivotal point about which all other accumulation takes place.

Food processing plants represent a good occupational setting for accomplishing the settling out program for many reasons: (1) These plants had a large number of openings for entry level workers. (2) Workers are more inclined to accept food processing work because it begins in the fall after most agricultural work is completed. (3) The plants are gearing for year-round operation, but until they achieve it, their layoff period coincides with peak needs for seasonal agricultural workers. (4) For the migrant, there is a sense of continuity of work because of his familiarity with agricultural products and because the work is largely manipulative. (5) There are no educational requirements.

The ROI'S maintained close contact with applicants--supplying them with job information and counseling about how to approach their relocation successfully. At times ROI'S not only developed jobs but took applicants to the site and assisted with communication until the worker actually entered the job. The ROI was available for follow-up almost any time. The foreman would call about situations that might cause the green hand to quit or be fired. These instances grew almost entirely out of misunderstandings, and ROI'S were successful in re-introducing workers back on the job. With this relationship, other mutually advantageous exchanges resulted.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Two of the most limiting factors have been lack of housing and child care centers. As a participant in the Inter-Agency group, we outlined these priority items to which we would direct our influence and assistance. There are now 80 winterized housing units and a child care center being constructed by a Housing Authority. Also under construction are 30 self-help houses plus 40 apartment units.

We believe that most of the problems associated with "settling out" migrant families can be resolved if "settling" is based upon a job -- upon reality -- and upon room for future development.

Ray Pozeman

I shall address my remarks to the general problem of relocating families desiring to settle out of the migratory stream including such related activities as vocational training and financial assistance.

We have had two vocational training programs funded for migrants. The experience of the first program produced a number of positive conclusions which proved of value in the development of the second MDTA training project. These findings should be considered in the implementation of all training programs under RMS:

-- There should be a continuous dialogue between the individuals concerned with the development of a training project.

-- Those responsible for the selection of trainees should be thoroughly indoctrinated in MDTA objectives, requirements, and procedures before making any selections.

-- Funding of training courses for migrant workers should be timed so that classes can be scheduled for the longest period the migrant will be available before the next migration.

-- A revision should be made in the MDTA regulations which require that family heads must be enrolled before other family members can be considered for training and that no more than two members of a family, including the head, can be approved for training allowances.

-- A prospective trainee's educational level should be determined by applying a test to find the level at which he is functional.

-- Before referral, prospective trainees should be counselled as to what their responsibilities would be while in training.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

I would like to tell about three efforts to relocate project families. Of the 26 workers who, with their families, were moved to Friona, Texas to work in a meat packing plant, only 10 remain. Ten were discharged, largely due to frequent unexcused absences. Six quit for various reasons. However, the employer is not discouraged, feeling that this is in line with normal turnover.

A different type of experiment is the placement of family heads and other family members with a poultry processor on Maryland's Eastern Shore. Sixty-five were placed in October and November 1970 and 60 more have been requested. The transportation expenses are being paid by the employer. Brownsville has a long waiting list for these jobs.

A third relocation is the placement of auto-body mechanics in Houston. Jobs were offered to all of the 10 MDTA graduates who went to Houston at R&D expense to explore job opportunities. Seven reported to Houston jobs while three found employment in the valley.

Migratory families desiring to settle out of the migratory stream have been assisted by the $50,000 Emergency Grant and Loans Fund administered for the Dallas Regional Office by the Lower Rio Grande Development Council. As of January 6, 1971, 93 loans in the amount of $22,592 had been made and $5,302 had been repaid. Thirty-four grants for a total of $4,588 had been made. The administrative costs, to January 6 were $460.

Since the R&D project is designed to experiment with new methods and techniques, the injection of such a project into the mainstream operations of an employment security agency does not work well. Regulations designed to limit an employee's activities to routine procedures, as well as the subordination of project participants to a hierarchy of authority, tends to kill the desired effort to be innovative. I recommend that this, or any, Experimental and Demonstration Project be implemented outside the mainstream of local office operations.

Charles Routhe

I feel that the best way to share with you thoughts on management and supervision is to identify those factors that significantly influenced our decisions in Minnesota relative to the management and supervision of a statewide migrant program we conducted in 1970.

Before one can manage or supervise, he must define that which is to be managed or supervised. No two States would have the same definition. It should be concerned with such matters as the size of the geographic area and migrant population, the characteristics of the jobs and employers, the economic characteristics of the area, the quality of migrant housing, the availability of services from other agencies, and the organizational structure of your agency.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Staff composition is, of course, related to the resources you have available. You have heard of the value of having staff of Mexican American descent, preferably with a first hand knowledge of migrant problems, and of the value of resident staff well versed in the availability of resources in the area. However, in selecting staff, the qualifications I consider most important are a very deep and sensitive concern for people; the ability to recognize when assistance is needed; and the willingness to pursue an efficient, yet reasonable, course of action toward the solution of the problem within the existing structure. Because we could not find individuals who carried all the aforementioned credentials, it was our decision to adopt the team approach.

Organizational structures were designed to obtain maximum output of services from the limited resource input available. Because they happened to be the best compatible arrangement available to use at that time, two distinct organizational structures were established for different parts of the State. The first was direct line supervision from the State Chief of Rural Manpower Service to the District MRD Coordinator who operated from a mobile trailer--completely apart from any supervision by a local office or field supervisor. In the second instance, supervision was provided by a local office manager who reported to a field supervisor. The Chief, Rural Manpower Services, only provided functional supervision and direction.

Management and supervision are affected by policy. In Minnesota, the basic policy for 1970 was that nonproject as well as project migrants would be served in the broad perspective of the E&D concepts on a statewide basis. Specific policy included such matters as the following:

--To maintain quality with a limited staff, the objective was not to cover 100 percent of the migrants. Those with subsequent job commitments were excluded from early schedules and were to be contacted only to the degree possible.

--ROI's were to avoid forcing something onto the workers they did not want or need.

--In discussing subsequent employment, recognition of the worker's present job commitment was to be observed.

--Field contacts with workers were to be preceded by a communication with the grower.

--ROI's were to establish communication with supportive service agencies and associations with them were to be conducted in a tactful cooperative manner.

--ROI's were to be given as wide a latitude as possible.

I have brushed over the top of many items and would be glad to give you further information if you need it.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Question and Answer Period

Mr. Bozeman was asked for what purposes the emergency loan fund was used. He replied that, when the 26 families were relocated at Friona, loans were made to help with the closing costs on the purchase of houses or for the first month's rent on a rental unit. Money was also loaned for furniture and bedding.

Mr. Bozeman also explained how the experience of the Friona experiment was applied to avoiding similar mistakes in the relocation of workers to the Eastern Shore processor. A more careful selection was made and only the workers went to the new job. It is planned that the families will not join them until the workers have been on the job for 6 months.

Mr. Joe Montoya of the National office reported that the primary reason for migrants' returning from Friona was the employer's reneging on the number of hours of work provided.

Mr. Mock stressed the fact that funds are essential to settling out migrants. Without the funds that were made available, the families that settled out in Region V could not have stayed.

According to Mr. Olsen,

"Nothing establishes rapport like a dollar bill."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SPECIAL MEETING: FLORIDA RECRUITMENT

National Rural Manpower Conference--1971

Discussion Leader:
Paul Corbin, Region III.

Discussants:
Frank P. Shea, Region I.
Michael J. Waldron, Region II.
V.A. Milton, Region IV.
Joseph C. Kasper, Region V.
Roy L. Haynes, Region VI.

Representatives of the regions which participated in the east coast migration pattern reported on various problems in connection with handling migratory agricultural workers in their regions. A surplus of workers, particularly in Florida, was apparent from these reports. Crew leaders presented a problem in some areas, since they were not meeting their legal obligations. Inadequate preparation of orders has been a problem for some time, and the steps that need to be taken to improve the quality of orders was a topic of considerable discussion. The following summarizes the reports of the regional representatives:

Paul Corbin

Seventy-three percent of the orders forwarded to Florida were filled. Of the 10,000 openings, 6,000 were filled. Pennsylvania and Maryland have new housing laws.

Frank P. Shea

Migratory crews are not eager to come to New England because of the travel distance and the inconvenient timing of the crop seasons. However, four States did forward orders to Florida. The Florida agency was somewhat reluctant to fill orders from employers that use foreign workers.

Michael J. Waldron

Our region is trying to concentrate on improving the quality of the orders. We feel that clearance orders should be filled out only after giving careful consideration to the supply of workers in the area. We request that crews be thoroughly screened.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

V.A. Milton

As a result of the unfavorable economic situation, Florida has more workers than it can use. This is aggravated by the lack of job opportunities in the midwest and by the return of workers who had left the State.

I should like to call attention to three problem areas in regard to recruiting workers from Florida:

1. Housing. The orders received by Florida do not always give a clear cut statement about the nature of the housing.

2. Wages. The piece rates for picking apples in Virginia and West Virginia have stayed the same for 4 or 5 years. Today they are no longer competitive with the wages offered in other States.

3. Crew leaders. Many of the crew leaders have shown a reluctance to collect Social Security payments and report them.

Joseph C. Kasper

Relatively few workers from the east coast pattern come to this region. Today, there is almost no opportunity for them because of the competition from local workers and Texas migrants. The quality of orders from our State agencies is improving, because experience with court cases has brought home to them the importance of preparing orders carefully.

Roy L. Haynes

Crew leader registration is a problem in our region. Whereas 2,200 crew leaders were registered in 1965, only 1,395 were registered in 1971.

Migration to Florida is creating problems. Orders are frequently cancelled. Workers returning from Florida complain of underemployment. Texas is facing the problem of free wheelers. Although Texas received no orders from Florida, an estimated 16,000 Texas workers went there.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SPECIAL MEETING: TEXAS RECRUITMENT

National Rural Manpower Conference--1971

Discussion Leader:
William B. McFarland, Region VI.

Discussants:
James L. Strauss, Texas Employment Commission.
Joseph C. Kasper, Region V.
Kalervo W. Makela, Region VII.
David M. Cano, Region VIII.
Norman Lueck, Region IX.
Uvalde Garcia, Region X.

Rural Manpower staff members representing those regions which employ migratory workers from Texas were asked to present the outlook for migratory labor in their regions in 1971, to describe the problems encountered in 1970, and to suggest probable solutions. Mr. Strauss opened the meeting with statistics to show that the number of Texas migrants placed through interstate clearance procedures has been falling off year by year, while the number of "free wheelers" (migrants seeking jobs without help) seems to be increasing. The regional directors, as well as speakers from the floor, reported labor surpluses. Employers, more and more, are either turning to mechanization or else doing their own recruiting without going to the employment security agencies. Thus, the employment security system has less control of migration than in former years. Faced with this situation, several speakers advocated a change in procedures. The following is a summary of this discussion.

James L. Strauss

The problems facing us today are no joking matter. Consider these TEC statistics: in 1968, we referred 47,345 workers who averaged 1.53 jobs per worker; in 1969, we referred 39,470 workers who averaged 1.12 jobs per worker; and in 1970, we referred 27,468 workers who, again, averaged 1.12 jobs per worker. Agents licensed through the Texas Bureau of Labor Statistics, who had recruited 35,000 workers in 1969, recruited only 24,000 workers for out-of-State employment in 1970. On the other hand, a report of the Hope, Arkansas Migratory Labor Camp dated November 30, 1970 showed that 56,513 people had gone through that camp compared with 55,038 by the same date in 1969. This leads us to believe there were more free wheelers than ever before.

There are three ways in which a migrant can be recruited in Texas: (1) go to the TEC in conjunction with interstate clearance; (2) secure a license from the TBLS (which is quite expensive), or place an order with a recruiter that has a license; and (3) contact crews or workers directly, which is in violation of the law.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

While some employers are directly recruiting Texas workers who happen to be in other States that do not have such a law, we have reason to believe that other out-of-State growers are contacting workers directly while they are still in Texas. For example, out-of-State employers who did not have clearance orders have asked us to collect travel money advanced to crew leaders in Texas that did not show.

When it was brought to our attention that free wheelers were flooding demand States, we urged migrants, through the press, radio, and television, not to leave the State without a firm job commitment. This did not deter migration.

The Governor's Interagency Task Force on Migratory Labor has recommended amending the Labor Agency Law to provide that the TBLS require licensed agents to show proof that the housing where workers will be domiciled meets Federal labor housing standards. More important, however, is that the TBLS be given enough personnel to control the migration of Texas workers who are in violation of Texas statutes.

From what I gather, the problems will not lessen in 1971. We hope that all States involved will try to secure valid orders so that we can prevent free wheeling as much as possible.

Joseph C. Kasper

The primary developments on the migrant labor front in Region V have been: (1) the labor surplus, (2) the migrant E&D project, (3) the continued recession, (4) the increase in union organizing, and (5) the proliferation of legal action.

In 1970 we lost about 17,000 jobs for migrants and in 1971 we will probably lose another 17,000 or so, because the continuing recession makes more local workers available. Moreover, processors' heavy inventories make them less willing to contract for acreage. Because of the E&D project, we are better able to cope with stranded migrants. Through the Migrant Council we have Army installations to provide emergency shelter and USDA help in providing food stamps.

We have law suits filed in Michigan, Wisconsin, and Illinois. This shows we can no longer afford to be careless about housing standards. Clearance orders must be treated as quasi-legal documents.

Kalervo W. Makela

We also expect another surplus. We consider it worthwhile to contact the workers personally and tell them there is no work in the Great Lakes States.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

David M. Cane

We expect a lot of free wheeling workers but don't expect a bad surplus. Because of unfavorable publicity directed against a large grower, other growers are improving their housing.

Norman H. Lueck

Nevada and Arizona had no serious problems last year. California had a surplus. Stranded migrants were assisted by welfare agencies and by donations of clothing from private individuals. Hawaii had a shortage of workers at the peak of the pineapple season and may recruit in California this year.

Uvalde Garcia

An important development in Region X has been the Migrant E&D program. It is a wonderful program. Other important developments are the labor surplus and unions. We should take a hard look at the unions and ask ourselves,

"What is causing labor unrest? Are we creating the problem?"

We need to take a look at the Annual Worker Plan and the Secretary's Regulations from the standpoint of their relationship to labor surpluses. I think they are out of date and ought to be revised.

Discussion Period

The increasing prevalence of free wheelers was the subject of much discussion. Mr. Harris of Florida reported that Texas workers are coming to Florida in increasing numbers because of the disruption of migration patterns in the mid-west. Nearly all of them are free wheelers. Florida growers prefer to use free wheelers because it saves them transportation expenses and avoids housing problems. Following unfavorable television publicity, many Florida growers tore down substandard housing, thus creating a shortage. On the positive side, the Coca Cola Company was motivated to improve its housing. The Florida agency is trying to regain control of migration but finds it difficult to do. The housing regulations as a cause of losing orders, was reiterated by many speakers.

Several speakers thought the Annual Worker Plan was out of date. Many objected to going to the trouble of filling out the ES-369 when, increasingly, workers are returning to Texas after one out-of-State job. Speakers from Texas and Region VI urged the continuance of this form since it is the only way Texas knows that the job has been filled. Also, if the first contact is made out-of-State, the ES-369 gives a record of what Texas workers were assisted. Others discussed new uses for the ES-369, such as a means of implementing the Migrant E&D format or a means of scheduling a succession of farm and nonfarm jobs.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

A delegate from Nebraska reported that migrants had been strongly urged to remain in his State and take permanent nonfarm jobs. The response was entirely negative. Mr. Mahan of Region VII urged that resources be committed to encouraging and helping migrants to get out of the migrant stream.

Mr. Mock of Region V advocated the Migrant E&D format as the direction in which RMS should be moving. The loss of requests for employer services does not mean RMS is out of business. On the contrary, it means redoubling efforts to serve the migrant workers, whether or not their employers are placing orders with State agencies. The situation requires a change of focus towards the workers' needs and how to meet them.

Mr. McFarland of Region VI summarized the discussion by calling attention to the about-face in the supply-demand situation. At past conferences the demand States, armed with abundant orders, were competing for a limited supply of workers. Today, requests from employers are fast disappearing and RMS wonders what to do with the surplus workers. He also thought the E&D format would be useful. He urged the demand States to find out what migrants are interested in vocational training and forward the information to Texas.